00070579

NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 06 February, 2016

THE

WORKS

B 9 24

70579 ae

OF

WILLIAM E. CHANNING, D. D.

F. f. 17

VOL. VI.

Third Edition.

GLASGOW: JAMES HEDDERWICK & SON.
EDINBURGH: OLIVER & BOYD.
LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & CO.

1844.

081
Cha/Woo
70579

00070579

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE present volume concludes the Edition of Dr. Channing's Works, the first five volumes of which appeared in 1840. As it brings up the writings of the Author to the period of his lamented decease, this edition now contains all the productions of his pen which he desired should be preserved. The present, like the preceding volumes, has been reprinted from copies of his writings corrected by the Author, and transmitted to the Publishers either by himself or his son, Mr. W. F. Channing. The edition may therefore be regarded as at once accurate and complete.

It may be proper to state that the article entitled "Introductory Remarks," was written for an American edition of Dr. Channing's Works, published in 1841. Had it been received in time, it would of course have been prefixed to the first volume; nevertheless, it was considered too important to be omitted in its present place.

GLASGOW, Aug. 1, 1844.

CONTENTS OF VOL. VI.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS,	7
EMANCIPATION,	41
DISCOURSE ON THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF THE REV. JOSEPH TUCKERMAN, D. D.	125
THE PRESENT AGE,	181
THE DUTY OF THE FREE STATES — PART I.	217
THE DUTY OF THE FREE STATES — PART II.	269
ADDRESS ON THE EMANCIPATION OF THE SLAVES IN THE WEST INDIAN ISLANDS,	365
THE CHURCH,	411

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

THE following tracts, having passed through various editions at home and abroad, are now collected to meet the wishes of those who may incline to possess them in a durable form. In common with all writings which have obtained a good degree of notice, they have been criticised freely; but as they have been published not to dictate opinions, but to excite thought and inquiry, they have not failed of their end, even when they have provoked doubt or reply. They have, I think, the merit of being earnest expressions of the writer's mind, and of giving the results of quiet, long continued thought.

Some topics will be found to recur often, perhaps the reader may think too often; but it is in this way that a writer manifests his individuality, and he can in no other do justice to his own mind. Men are distinguished from one another, not merely by difference of thoughts, but often more by the different degrees of relief or prominence which they give to the same thoughts. In nature, what an immense dissimilarity do we observe in organised bodies, which consist of the same parts or elements, but in which these are

found in great diversity of proportions! So, to learn what a man is, it is not enough to dissect his mind, and see separately the thoughts and feelings which successively possess him. The question is, what thoughts and feelings predominate, stand out most distinctly, and give a hue and impulse to the common actions of his mind? what are his great ideas? These form the man, and by their truth and dignity he is very much to be judged.

The following writings will be found to be distinguished by nothing more than by the high estimate which they express of human nature. A respect for the human soul breathes through them. The time may come for unfolding my views more fully on this and many connected topics. As yet, I have given but fragments; and, on this account, I have been sometimes misapprehended. The truth is, that a man who looks through the present disguises and humbling circumstances of human nature, and speaks with earnestness of what it was made for and what it may become, is commonly set down by men of the world as a romancer, and, what is far worse, by the religious, as a minister to human pride, perhaps as exalting man against God. A few remarks on this point seem, therefore, a proper introduction to these volumes.

It is not, however, my purpose in this place to enter far into the consideration of the greatness of human nature, and of its signs and expressions in the inward and outward experience of men. It will be sufficient here to observe, that the greatness of the soul is especially seen in the intellectual energy which discerns absolute, universal truth, in the idea of God, in freedom of will and moral power, in disinterestedness and

self-sacrifice, in the boundlessness of love, in aspirations after perfection, in desires and affections, which time and space cannot confine, and the world cannot fill. The soul, viewed in these lights, should fill us with awe. It is an immortal germ, which may be said to contain now within itself what endless ages are to unfold. It is truly an image of the infinity of God, and no words can do justice to its grandeur. There is, however, another, and very different aspect of our nature. When we look merely at what it now is, at its present development, at what falls under present consciousness, we see in it much of weakness and limitation, and still more, we see it narrowed and degraded by error and sin. This is the aspect under which it appears to most men; and so strong is the common feeling of human infirmity, that a writer, holding higher views, must state them with caution if he would be listened to without prejudice. My language, I trust, will be sufficiently measured, as my object at present is not to set forth the greatness of human nature, but to remove difficulties in relation to it, in the minds of religious people.

From the direction which theology has taken, it has been thought that to ascribe anything to man was to detract so much from God. The disposition has been, to establish striking contrasts between man and God, and not to see and rejoice in the likeness between them. It has been thought, that to darken the creation was the way to bring out more clearly the splendour of the Creator. The human being has been subjected to a stern criticism. It has been forgotten that he is as yet an infant, new to existence, unconscious of his powers; and he has been expected to see clearly, walk firmly,

and act perfectly. Especially in estimating his transgressions, the chief regard has been had, not to his finite nature and present stage of development, but to the infinity of the being against whom he has sinned; so that God's greatness, instead of being made a ground of hope, has been used to plunge man into despair.

I have here touched on a great spring of error in religion, and of error among the most devout. I refer to the tendency of fervent minds to fix their thoughts exclusively or unduly on God's infinity. It is said, in devotional writings, that exalted and absorbing views of God enter into the very essence of piety; that our grand labour should be, to turn the mind from the creature to the Creator; that the creature cannot sink too low in our estimation, or God fill too high a sphere. God, we are told, must not be limited; nor are his rights to be restrained by any rights in his creatures. These are made to minister to their Maker's glory, not to glorify themselves. They wholly depend on him, and have no power which they can call their own. His sovereignty, awful and omnipotent, is not to be kept in check, or turned from its purposes, by any claims of his subjects. Man's place is the dust. The entire prostration of his faculties is the true homage he is to offer God. He is not to exalt his reason or his sense of right against the decrees of the Almighty. He has but one lesson to learn, that he is nothing, that God is All in All. Such is the common language of theology.

These views are exceedingly natural. That the steady, earnest contemplation of the Infinite One, should so dazzle the mind as to obscure or annihilate all things else, ought not to surprise us. By looking

at the sun, we lose the power of seeing other objects. It was, I conceive, one design of God in hiding himself so far from us, in throwing around himself the veil of his works, to prevent this very evil. He intended that our faculties should be left at liberty to act on other things besides himself, that the will should not be crushed by his overpowering greatness, that we should be free agents, that we should recognise rights in ourselves and in others as well as in the Creator, and thus be introduced into a wide and ever enlarging sphere of action and duty. Still the idea of the Infinite is of vast power, and the mind, in surrendering itself to it, is in danger of becoming unjust to itself and other beings, of losing that sentiment of self-respect which should be inseparable from a moral nature, of degrading the intellect by the forced belief of contradictions which God is supposed to sanction, and of losing that distinct consciousness of moral freedom, of power over itself, without which the interest of life and the sense of duty are gone.

Let it not be imagined from these remarks, that I would turn the mind from God's Infinity. This is the grand truth; but it must not stand alone in the mind. The finite is something real as well as the infinite. We must reconcile the two in our theology. It is as dangerous to exclude the former as the latter. God surpasses all human thought; yet human thought, mysterious, unbounded, "wandering through eternity," is not to be contemned. God's sovereignty is limitless; still man has rights. God's power is irresistible; still man is free. On God, we entirely depend; yet we can and do act from ourselves, and determine our own characters. These antagonist ideas, if so they may be

called, are equally true, and neither can be spared. It will not do for an impassioned or an abject piety, to wink one class of them out of sight. In a healthy mind they live together; and the worst error in religion has arisen from throwing a part of them into obscurity.

In most religious systems, the tendency has been to seize exclusively on the idea of the Infinite, and to sacrifice to this the finite, the created, the human. This I have said is very natural. To the eye of sense, man is such a mote in the creation, his imperfections and sins are so prominent in his history, the changes of his life are so sudden, so awful, he vanishes into such darkness, the mystery of the tomb is so fearful, all his outward possessions are so fleeting, the earth which he treads on so insecure, and all surrounding nature subject to such fearful revolutions, that the reflective and sensitive mind is prone to see Nothingness inscribed on the human being and on all things that are made, and to rise to God as the only reality. Another more influential feeling contributes to the same end. The mind of man, in its present infancy and blindness, is apt to grow servile through fear, and seeks to propitiate the Divine Being by flattery and self-depreciation. Thus deep are the springs of religious error. To admit all the elements of truth into our system, at once to adore the infinity of God and to give due importance to our own free moral nature, is no very easy work. But it must be done. Man's free activity is as important to religion as God's infinity. In the kingdom of Heaven, the moral power of the subject is as essential as the omnipotence of the Sovereign. The rights of both have the same sacredness. To rob man of his dignity is as truly to subvert religion,

as to strip God of his perfection. We must believe in man's agency as truly as in the Divine, in his freedom as truly as in his dependence, in his individual being as truly as in the great doctrine of his living in God. Just as far as the desire of exalting the Divinity obscures these conceptions, our religion is sublimated into mysticism or degraded into servility.

In the Oriental world, the human mind has tended strongly to fix on the idea of the Infinite, the Vast, the Incomprehensible. In its speculations it has started from God. Swallowed up in his greatness, it has annihilated the creature. Perfection has been thought to lie in self-oblivion, in losing one's self in the Divinity, in establishing exclusive communion with God. The mystic worshipper fled from society to wildernesses, where not even nature's beauty might divert the soul from the Unseen. Living on roots, sleeping on the rocky floor of his cave, he hoped to absorb himself in the One and the Infinite. The more the consciousness of the individual was lost, and the more the will and the intellect became passive or yielded to the universal soul, the more perfect seemed the piety.

From such views naturally sprung Pantheism. No being was at last recognised but God. He was pronounced the only reality. The universe seemed a succession of shows, shadows, evanescent manifestations of the One Ineffable Essence. The human spirit was but an emanation, soon to be reabsorbed in its source. God, it was said, bloomed in the flower, breathed in the wind, flowed in the stream, and thought in the human soul. All our powers were but movements of one infinite force. Under the deceptive spectacle of multiplied individuals intent on various ends, there was but

one agent. Life, with its endless changes, was but the heaving of one and the same eternal ocean.

This mode of thought naturally gave birth or strength to that submission to despotic power, which has characterised the Eastern world. The sovereign, in whom the whole power of the state was centred, became an emblem of the One Infinite Power, and was worshipped as its representative. An unresisting quietism naturally grew out of the contemplation of God as the all-absorbing and irresistible energy. Man, a bubble, arising out of the ocean of the universal soul, and fated soon to vanish in it again, had plainly no destiny to accomplish, which could fill him with hope or rouse him to effort. In the East the individual was counted nothing. In Greece and Rome he was counted much, and he did much. In the Greek and the Roman the consciousness of power was indeed too little chastened by religious reverence. Their gods were men. Their philosophy, though in a measure borrowed from or tinctured with the Eastern, still spoke of man as his own master, as having an independent happiness in the energy of his own will. As far as they thus severed themselves from God, they did themselves great harm; but in their recognition, however imperfect, of the grandeur of the soul, lay the secret of their vast influence on human affairs.

In all ages of the church, the tendency of the religious mind to the exclusive thought of God, to the denial or forgetfulness of all other existence and power, has come forth in various forms. The Catholic church, notwithstanding its boasted unity, has teemed with mystics, who have sought to lose themselves in God. It would seem as if the human mind, cut off by this

church from free, healthful inquiry, had sought liberty in this vague contemplation of the Infinite. In the class, just referred to, were found many noble spirits, especially Fenelon, whose quietism, with all its amiableness, we must look on as a disease.

In Protestantism, the same tendency to exalt God and annihilate the creature has manifested itself, though in less pronounced forms. We see it in Quakerism, and Calvinism, the former striving to reduce the soul to silence, to suspend its action, that in its stillness God alone may be heard; and the latter, making God the only power in the universe, and annihilating the free will, that one will alone may be done in heaven and on earth.

Calvinism will complain of being spoken of as an approach to Pantheism. It will say, that it recognises distinct minds from the Divine. But what avails this, if it robs these minds of self-determining force, of original activity; if it makes them passive recipients of the Universal Force; if it sees in human action only the necessary issues of foreign impulse. The doctrine, that God is the only Substance, which is Pantheism, differs little from the doctrine, that God is the only active power of the universe. For what is substance without power? It is a striking fact, that the philosophy which teaches that matter is an inert substance, and that God is the force which pervades it, has led men to question, whether any such thing as matter exists; whether the powers of attraction and repulsion, which are regarded as the indwelling Deity, be not its whole essence. Take away force, and substance is a shadow and might as well vanish from the universe. Without a free power in man, he is nothing. The divine agent within him

is everything. Man acts only in show. He is a phenominal existence, under which the One Infinite Power is manifested; and is this much better than Pantheism?

One of the greatest of all errors, is the attempt to exalt God, by making him the sole cause, the sole agent in the universe, by denying to the creature freedom of will and moral power, by making man a mere recipient and transmitter of a foreign impulse. This, if followed out consistently, destroys all moral connexion between God and his creatures. In aiming to strengthen the physical, it ruptures the moral bond, which holds them together. To extinguish the free will is to strike the conscience with death, for both have but one and the same life. It destroys responsibility. It puts out the light of the universe; it makes the universe a machine. It freezes the fountain of our moral feelings, of all generous affection and lofty aspirations. Pantheism, if it leave man a free agent, is a comparatively harmless speculation, as we see in the case of Milton. The denial of moral freedom, could it really be believed, would prove the most fatal of errors. If Edwards' work on the will could really answer its end, if it could thoroughly persuade men that they were bound by an irresistible necessity, that their actions were fixed links in the chain of destiny, that there was but one agent, God, in the universe; it would be one of the most pernicious books ever issued from our press. Happily it is a demonstration which no man believes, which the whole consciousness contradicts.

It is a fact worthy of serious thought and full of solemn instruction, that many of the worst errors have grown out of the religious tendencies of the mind. So necessary is it to keep watch over our whole nature,

to subject the highest sentiments to the calm, conscientious reason. Men starting from the idea of God, have been so dazzled by it, as to forget or misinterpret the universe. They have come to see in him the only force in creation, and in other beings only signs, shadows, echoes of this. Absolute dependence is the only relation to God which they have left to human beings. Our infinitely nobler relations, those which spring from the power of free obedience to a moral law, their theory dissolves. The moral nature, of which freedom is the foundation and essence, which confers rights and imposes duties, which is the ground of praise and blame, which lies at the foundation of self-respect, of friendship between man and man, of spiritual connexion between man and his Maker, which is the spring of holy enthusiasm and heavenly aspiration, which gives to life its interest, to creation its glory, this is annihilated by the mistaken piety, which, to exalt God, to make him All in All, immolates to him the powers of the universe.

This tendency, as we have seen, gave birth in former ages to asceticism, drove some of the noblest men into cloisters or caverns, infected them with the fatal notion that there was an hostility between their relations to God and their relations to his creatures, and of course persuaded them to make a sacrifice of the latter. To this we owe systems of theology degrading human nature, denying its power and grandeur, breaking it into subjection to the priest through whom alone God is supposed to approach the abject multitude, and placing human virtue in exaggerated humiliations. The idea of God, the grandest of all, and which ought above all to elevate the soul, has too often depressed it and led good minds very far astray, a consideration

singularly fitted to teach us tolerant views of error, and to enjoin caution and sobriety in religious speculation.

I hope that I shall not be thought wanting in a just tolerance, in the strictures now offered on those systems of theology and philosophy, which make God the only power in the universe and rob man of his dignity. Among the authors of these, may be found some of the greatest and best men. To this class belonged Hartley, whose work on Man carries indeed the taint of materialism and necessity, but still deserves to be reckoned among the richest contributions ever made to the science of mind, whilst it breathes the profoundest piety. Our own Edwards was as eminent for religious as for intellectual power. The consistency of great error with great virtue is one of the lessons of universal history. But error is not made harmless by such associations. The false theories of which I have spoken, though not thoroughly believed, have wrought much evil. They have done much, I think, to perpetuate those abject views of human nature, which keep it where it is, which check men's aspirations, and reconcile them to their present poor modes of thought and action as the fixed unalterable laws of their being.

Many religious people fall into the error which I have wished to expose, through the belief that they thus glorify the Creator. "The glory of God," they say, "is our chief end;" and this is accomplished as they suppose by taking all power from man and transferring all to his Maker. We have here an example of the injury done by imperfect apprehension, and a vague misty use of Scripture language. The "glory of God" is undoubtedly to be our end; but what does this

consist in? It means the shining forth of his perfection in his creation, especially in his spiritual offspring; and it is best promoted by awakening in these their highest faculties, by bringing out in ourselves and others the image of God in which all are made. An enlightened, disinterested human being, morally strong, and exerting a wide influence by the power of virtue, is the clearest reflection of the divine splendour on earth, and we glorify God in proportion as we form ourselves and others after this model. The glory of the Maker lies in his work. We do not honour him by breaking down the human soul, by connecting it with him only by a tie of slavish dependence. By making him the author of a mechanical universe, we ascribe to him a low kind of agency. It is his glory that he creates beings like himself, free beings, not slaves; that he forms them to obedience, not by physical agency, but by moral influences; that he confers on them the reality, not the show of power; and opens to their faith and devout strivings a futurity of progress and glory without end. It is not by darkening and dishonouring the creature, that we honour the Creator. Those men glorify God most, who look with keen eye and loving heart on his works, who catch in all some glimpses of beauty and power, who have a spiritual sense for good in its dimmest manifestations, and who can so interpret the world, that it becomes a bright witness to the Divinity.

To such remarks as these it is commonly objected, that we thus obscure, if we do not deny, the doctrine of Entire Dependence on God, a doctrine which is believed to be eminently the foundation of religion. But not so. On the contrary, the greater the creature,

the more extensive is his dependence; the more he has to give thanks for, the more he owes to the free gift of his Creator. No matter what grandeur or freedom we ascribe to our powers, if we maintain as we ought, that they are bestowed, inspired, sustained by God; that he is their life; that to him we owe all the occasions and spheres of their action and all the helps and incitements by which they are perfected. On account of their grandeur and freedom they are not less his gifts; and in as far as they are divine, their natural tendency is not towards idolatrous self-reliance, but towards the grateful, joyful recognition of their adorable Source. The doctrine of dependence is in no degree impaired by the highest views of the human soul.

Let me farther observe, that the doctrine of entire dependence is not, as is often taught, the fundamental doctrine of religion, so that to secure this, all other ideas must be renounced. And this needs to be taught, because nothing has been more common with theologians than to magnify our dependence, at the expense of everything elevated in our nature. Man has been stripped of freedom, and spoken of as utterly impotent, lest he should trench on God's sole, supreme power. To eradicate this error, it should be understood that our dependence is not our chief relation to God, and that it is not the ground of religion, if by religion we understand the sentiment of faith, reverence, and love towards the Divinity. That piety may exist, it is not enough to know that God alone and constantly sustains all beings. This is not a foundation for moral feelings towards him. The great question on which religion rests, is, *What kind* of a universe does he create and

sustain? Were a being of vast power to give birth to a system of unmeasured, unmitigated evil, dependence on him would be anything but a ground of reverence. We should hate it, and long to flee from it into non-existence. The great question, I repeat it, is, what is the nature, the end, the purpose of the creation which God upholds? On this, and on the relations growing out of this, religion wholly rests. True, we depend on the Creator; and so does the animal; so does the clod; and were this the only relation, we should be no more bound to worship than they. We sustain a grander relation, that of rational, moral, free beings to a Spiritual Father. We are not mere material substances, subjected to an irresistible physical law, or mere animals subjected to resistless instincts; but are Souls on which a moral law is written, in which a divine oracle is heard. Take away the moral relation of the created spirit to the Universal Spirit, and that of entire dependence would remain as it is now; but no ground, and no capacity of religion would remain; and the splendour of the universe would fade away.

We must start in religion from our own souls. In these is the fountain of all divine truth. An outward revelation is only possible and intelligible, on the ground of conceptions and principles, previously furnished by the soul. Here is our primitive teacher and light. Let us not disparage it. There are, indeed, philosophical schools of the present day, which tell us, that we are to start in all our speculations from the Absolute, the Infinite. But we rise to these conceptions from the contemplation of our own nature; and even if it were not so, of what avail would be the notion of an Absolute, Infinite existence, an Uncaused Unity, if stripped

of all those intellectual and moral attributes, which we learn only from our own souls. What but a vague shadow, a sounding name, is the metaphysical Deity, the substance without modes, the being without properties, the naked unity, which performs such a part in some of our philosophical systems? The only God, whom our thoughts can rest on, and our hearts can cling to, and our consciences can recognise, is the God whose image dwells in our own souls. The grand ideas of Power, Reason, Wisdom, Love, Rectitude, Holiness, Blessedness, that is, of all God's attributes, come from within, from the action of our own spiritual nature. Many indeed think that they learn God from marks of design and skill in the outward world; but our ideas of design and skill, of a determining cause, of an end or purpose, are derived from consciousness, from our own souls. Thus the soul is the spring of our knowledge of God.

These remarks might easily be extended, but these will suffice to show, that in insisting on the claims of our nature to reverence, I have not given myself to a subject of barren speculation. It has intimate connections with religion; and deep injury to religion has been the consequence of its neglect. I have also felt and continually insisted, that a new reverence for man was essential to the cause of social reform. As long as men regard one another as they now do, that is as little better than the brutes, they will continue to treat one another brutally. Each will strive, by craft or skill, to make others his tools. There can be no spirit of brotherhood, no true peace, any farther than men come to understand their affinity with and relation to God and the infinite purpose for which he gave them life.

As yet these ideas are treated as a kind of spiritual romance; and the teacher, who really expects men to see in themselves and one another the children of God, is smiled at as a visionary. The reception of this plainest truth of Christianity would revolutionise society, and create relations among men not dreamed of at the present day. A union would spring up, compared with which our present friendships would seem estrangements. Men would know the import of the word Brother, as yet nothing but a word to multitudes. None of us can conceive the change of manners, the new courtesy and sweetness, the mutual kindness, deference, and sympathy, the life and energy of efforts for social melioration, which are to spring up, in proportion as man shall penetrate beneath the body to the spirit, and shall learn what the lowest human being is. Then insults, wrongs, and oppressions, now hardly thought of, will give a deeper shock than we receive from crimes which the laws punish with death. Then man will be sacred in man's sight; and to injure him will be regarded as open hostility toward God. It has been under a deep feeling of the intimate connexion of better and juster views of human nature with all social and religious progress, that I have insisted on it so much in the following tracts, and I hope that the reader will not think that I have given it disproportioned importance.

I proceed to another sentiment, which is expressed so habitually in these writings as to constitute one of their characteristics, and which is intimately connected with the preceding topic. It is reverence for Liberty, for human rights; a sentiment which has grown with

my growth, which is striking deeper root in my age, which seems to me a chief element of true love for mankind, and which alone fits a man for intercourse with his fellow-creatures. I have lost no occasion for expressing my deep attachment to liberty in all its forms, civil, political, religious—to liberty of thought, speech, and the press, and of giving utterance to my abhorrence of all the forms of oppression. This love of freedom I have not borrowed from Greece or Rome. It is not the classical enthusiasm of youth, which, by some singular good fortune, has escaped the blighting influences of intercourse with the world. Greece and Rome are names of little weight to a Christian. They are warnings, rather than inspirers and guides. My reverence for human liberty and rights has grown up in a different school, under milder and holier discipline. Christianity has taught me to respect my race, and to reprobate its oppressors. It is because I have learned to regard man under the light of this religion, that I cannot bear to see him treated as a brute, insulted, wronged, enslaved—made to wear a yoke, to tremble before his brother, to serve him as a tool, to hold property and life at his will, to surrender intellect and conscience to the priest, or to seal his lips or belie his thoughts through dread of the civil power. It is because I have learned the essential equality of men before the common Father, that I cannot endure to see one man establishing his arbitrary will over another by fraud, or force, or wealth, or rank, or superstitious claims. It is because the human being has moral powers, because he carries a law in his own breast and was made to govern himself, that I cannot endure to see him taken out of his own hands and fashioned into a

tool by another's avarice or pride. It is because I see in him a great nature, the divine image, and vast capacities, that I demand for him means of self-development, spheres for free action—that I call society not to fetter, but to aid his growth. Without intending to disparage the outward, temporal advantages of liberty, I have habitually regarded it in a higher light, as the birthright of the soul, as the element in which men are to put themselves forth, to become conscious of what they are, and to fulfil the end of their being.

Christianity has joined with all history in inspiring me with a peculiar dread and abhorrence of the passion for power, for dominion over men. There is nothing, in the view of our Divine Teacher, so hostile to his divine spirit as the lust of domination. This we are accustomed to regard as eminently the sin of the Archfiend. "*By this sin fell the angels.*" It is the most satanic of all human passions, and it has inflicted more terrible evils on the human family than all others. It has made the names of king and priest the most appalling in history. There is no crime which has not been perpetrated for the strange pleasure of treading men under foot, of fastening chains on the body or mind. The strongest ties of nature have been rent asunder, her holiest feelings smothered—parents, children, brothers murdered, to secure dominion over man. The people have now been robbed of the necessaries of life, and now driven to the field of slaughter like flocks of sheep, to make one man the master of millions. Through this passion, government, ordained by God to defend the weak against the strong, to exalt right above might, has up to this time been the great wrong-doer. Its crimes throw those of private men into the shade.

Its murders reduce to insignificance those of the bandits, pirates, highwaymen, assassins, against whom it undertakes to protect society. How harmless at this moment are all the criminals of Europe, compared with the Russian power in Poland. This passion for power, which, in a thousand forms, with a thousand weapons, is warring against human liberty, and which Christianity condemns as its worst foe, I have never ceased to reprobate with whatever strength of utterance God has given me. Power trampling on right, whether in the person of king or priest, or in the shape of democracies, majorities, and republican slaveholders, is the saddest sight to him who honours human nature and desires its enlargement and happiness.

So fearful is the principle of which I have spoken, that I have thought it right to recommend restrictions on power and a simplicity in government beyond what most approve. Power, I apprehend, should not be suffered to run into great masses. No more of it should be confided to rulers than is absolutely necessary to repress crime and preserve public order. A purer age may warrant larger trusts; but the less of government now the better, if society be kept in peace. There should exist, if possible, no office to madden ambition. There should be no public prize tempting enough to convulse a nation. One of the tremendous evils of the world, is the monstrous accumulation of power in a few hands. Half a dozen men may, at this moment, light the fires of war through the world, may convulse all civilised nations, sweep earth and sea with armed hosts, spread desolation through the fields and bankruptcy through cities, and make themselves felt by some form of suffering through every household in

Christendom. Has not one politician recently caused a large part of Europe to bristle with bayonets? And ought this tremendous power to be lodged in the hands of any human being? Is any man pure enough to be trusted with it? Ought such a prize as this to be held out to ambition? Can we wonder at the shameless profligacy, intrigue, and the base sacrifices of public interests by which it is sought, and, when gained, held fast. Undoubtedly, great social changes are required to heal this evil, to diminish this accumulation of power. National spirit, which is virtual hostility to all countries but our own, must yield to a growing humanity, to a new knowledge of the spirit of Christ. Another important step is, a better comprehension by communities that government is at best a rude machinery, which can accomplish but very limited good, and which, when strained to accomplish what individuals should do for themselves, is sure to be perverted by selfishness to narrow purposes, or to defeat through ignorance its own ends. Man is too ignorant to govern much, to form vast plans for states and empires. Human policy has almost always been in conflict with the great laws of social well-being, and the less we rely on it the better. The less of power given to man over man the better. I speak, of course, of physical, political force. There is a power which cannot be accumulated to excess, I mean moral power, that of truth and virtue, the royalty of wisdom and love, of magnanimity and true religion. This is the guardian of all right. It makes those whom it acts on free. It is mightiest when most gentle. In the progress of society this is more and more to supersede the coarse workings of government. Force is to fall before it.

It must not be inferred from these remarks that I am an enemy to all restraint. Restraint, in some form or other, is an essential law of our nature, a necessary discipline running through life, and not to be escaped by any art or violence. Where can we go and not meet it? The powers of nature are all of them limits to human power. A never-ceasing force of gravity chains us to the earth. Mountains, rocks, precipices, and seas forbid our advances. If we come to society, restraints multiply on us. Our neighbour's rights limit our own. His property is forbidden ground. Usage restricts our free action, fixes our manners, and the language we must speak, and the modes of pursuing our ends. Business is a restraint, setting us wearisome tasks, and driving us through the same mechanical routine day after day. Duty is a restraint, imposing curbs on passion, enjoining one course and forbidding another with stern voice, with uncompromising authority. Study is a restraint, compelling us, if we would learn anything, to concentrate the forces of thought and to bridle the caprices of fancy. All law, divine or human, is, as the name imports, restraint. No one feels more than I do, the need of this element of human life. He who would fly from it must live in perpetual conflict with nature, society, and himself.

But all this does not prove that liberty, free action, is not an infinite good, and that we should seek and guard it with sleepless jealousy. For if we look at the various restraints of which I have spoken, we shall see that liberty is the end and purpose of all. Nature's powers around us hem us in, only to rouse a free power within us. It acts, that we should react. Burdens press on us, that the soul's elastic force should come

forth. Bounds are set that we should clear them. The weight which gravitation fastens to our limbs, incites us to borrow speed from winds and steam, and we fly where we seemed doomed to creep. The sea which first stopped us becomes the path to a new hemisphere. The sharp necessities of life, cold, hunger, pain, which chain man to toil, wake up his faculties and fit him for wider action. Duty restrains the passions, only that the nobler faculties and affections may have freer play, may ascend to God and embrace all his works. Parents impose restraint, that the child may learn to go alone, may outgrow authority. Government is ordained, that the rights and freedom of each and all may be inviolate. In study, thought is confined, that it may penetrate the depths of truth, may seize on the great laws of nature, and take a bolder range. Thus, freedom, ever-expanding action, is the end of all just restraint. Restraint, without this end, is a slavish yoke. How often has it broken the young spirit, tamed the heart and the intellect, and made social life a standing pool. We were made for free action. This alone is life, and enters into all that is good and great. Virtue is free choice of the right; love, the free embrace of the heart; grace, the free motion of the limbs; genius, the free, bold flight of thought—eloquence, its free and fervent utterance. Let me add, that social order is better preserved by liberty than by restraint. The latter, unless most wisely and justly employed, frets, exasperates, and provokes secret resistance; and still more, it is rendered needful very much by that unhappy constitution of society which denies to multitudes the opportunities of free activity. A community which should open a great variety of spheres to its members, so that all might

find free scope for their powers, would need little array of force for restraint. Liberty would prove the best peace-officer. The social order of New England, without a soldier, and almost without a police, bears loud witness to this truth. These views may suffice to explain the frequent recurrence of this topic in the following tracts.

I will advert to one topic more, and do it briefly, that I may not extend these remarks beyond reasonable bounds. I have written once and again on War, a hackneyed subject, as it is called, yet, one would think, too terrible ever to become a commonplace. Is this insanity never to cease? At this moment, whilst I write, two of the freest and most enlightened nations, having one origin, bound together above all others by mutual dependence, by the interweaving of interests, are thought by some to be on the brink of war. False notions of national honour, as false and unholy as those of the duellist, do most toward fanning this fire. Great nations, like great boys, place their honour in resisting insult and in fighting well. One would think the time had gone by in which nations needed to rush to arms, to prove that they were not cowards. If there is one truth which history has taught, it is that communities in all stages of society, from the most barbarous to the most civilised, have sufficient courage. No people can charge upon its conscience, that it has not shed blood enough in proof of its valour. Almost any man, under the usual stimulants of the camp, can stand fire. The poor wretch, enlisted from a dram-shop and turned into the ranks, soon fights like a "hero." Must France, and England, and America, after so many hard-fought

fields, go to war to disprove the charge of wanting spirit? Is it not time, that the point of honour should undergo some change, that some glimpses at least of the true glory of a nation should be caught by rulers and people? "It is the honour of a man to pass over a transgression," and so it is of states. To be wronged is no disgrace. To bear wrong generously, till every means of conciliation is exhausted; to recoil with manly dread from the slaughter of our fellow-creatures; to put confidence in the justice which other nations will do to our motives; to have that consciousness of courage which will make us scorn the reproach of cowardice; to feel that there is something grander than the virtue of savages; to desire peace for the world as well as ourselves, and to shrink from kindling a flame which may involve the world; these are the principles and feelings which do honour to a people. Has not the time come when a nation professing these may cast itself on the candour of mankind? Must fresh blood flow for ever, to keep clean the escutcheon of a nation's glory? For one, I look on war with a horror which no words can express. I have long wanted patience to read of battles. Were the world of my mind, no man would fight for glory; for the name of a commander, who has no other claim to respect, seldom passes my lips, and the want of sympathy drives him from my mind. The thought of man, God's immortal child, butchered by his brother; the thought of sea and land stained with human blood by human hands, of women and children buried under the ruins of besieged cities, of the resources of empires and the mighty powers of nature all turned by man's malignity into engines of torture and destruction; this

thought gives to earth the semblance of hell. I shudder as among demons. I cannot now, as I once did, talk lightly, thoughtlessly, of fighting with this or that nation. That nation is no longer an abstraction to me. It is no longer a vague mass. It spreads out before me into individuals, in a thousand interesting forms and relations. It consists of husbands and wives, parents and children, who love one another as I love my own home. It consists of affectionate women and sweet children. It consists of Christians, united with me to the common Saviour, and in whose spirit I reverence the likeness of his divine virtue. It consists of a vast multitude of labourers at the plough and in the workshop, whose toils I sympathise with, whose burden I should rejoice to lighten, and for whose elevation I have pleaded. It consists of men of science, taste, genius, whose writings have beguiled my solitary hours, and given life to my intellect and best affections. Here is the nation which I am called to fight with, into whose families I must send mourning, whose fall or humiliation I must seek through blood. I cannot do it, without a clear commission from God. I love this nation. Its men and women are my brothers and sisters. I could not, without unutterable pain, thrust a sword into their hearts. If, indeed, my country were invaded by hostile armies, threatening without disguise its rights, liberties, and dearest interests, I should strive to repel them, just as I should repel a criminal, who should enter my house to slay what I hold most dear, and what is entrusted to my care. But I cannot confound with such a case the common instances of war. In general, war is the work of ambitious men, whose principles have gained no strength from the experience of public life,

whose policy is coloured if not swayed by personal views or party interests, who do not seek peace with a single heart, who, to secure doubtful rights, perplex the foreign relations of the state, spread jealousies at home and abroad, enlist popular passions on the side of strife, commit themselves too far for retreat, and are then forced to leave to the arbitration of the sword, what an impartial umpire could easily have arranged. The question of peace and war, is too often settled for a country by men in whom a Christian, a lover of his race, can put little or no trust; and at the bidding of such men, is he to steep his hands in human blood? But this insanity is passing away. This savageness cannot endure, however hardened to it men are by long use. The hope of waking up some from their lethargy has induced me to recur to this topic so often in my writings.

I might name other topics, which occupy a large space in the following tracts, but enough has been said here. I will only add, that I submit these volumes to the public with a deep feeling of their imperfections. Indeed, on such subjects as God, and Christ, and Duty, and Immortality, and Perfection, how faint must all human utterance be! In another life, we shall look back on our present words as we do on the lispings of our childhood. Still these lispings conduct the child to higher speech. Still, amidst our weakness, we may learn something, and make progress, and quicken one another by free communication. We indeed know and teach comparatively little; but the known is not the less true or precious, because there is an infinite unknown. Nor ought our ignorance to discourage us, as if we were left to hopeless scepticism. There are great

truths which every honest heart may be assured of. There *is* such a thing as a serene, immovable conviction. Faith is a deep want of the soul. We have faculties for the spiritual, as truly as for the outward world. God, the foundation of all existence, may become to the mind the most real of all beings. We can and do see in virtue an everlasting beauty. The distinctions of right and wrong, the obligations of goodness and justice, the divinity of conscience, the moral connexion of the present and future life, the greatness of the character of Christ, the ultimate triumphs of truth and love, are to multitudes, not probable deductions, but intuitions accompanied with the consciousness of certainty. They shine with the clear, constant brightness of the lights of heaven. The believer feels himself resting on an everlasting foundation. It is to this power of moral or spiritual perception, that the following writings are chiefly addressed. I have had testimony, that they have not been wholly ineffectual, in leading some minds to a more living and unfaltering persuasion of great moral truths. Without this, I should be little desirous to send them out in this new form. I trust that they will meet some wants. Books which are to pass away, may yet render much service, by their fitness to the intellectual struggles and moral aspirations of the times in which they are written. If in this or in any way I can serve the cause of truth, humanity, and religion, I shall regard my labours as having earned the best recompense which God bestows on his creatures.

W. E. C.

Boston, April 18, 1841.

P. S. I intended to say that some of the following tracts savour of the periods in which they were written, and give opinions which time has disproved. In the article on Napoleon Bonaparte fears are expressed which have in a good measure passed away. In the same Review, the conqueror of Waterloo is spoken of as having only the merit of a great soldier. No one then believed that his opponents were soon to acknowledge his eminence in civil as in military affairs. The article is left as it was, from the difficulty of remodelling it, and because it may be useful as a record of past impressions.

EMANCIPATION.

The following tract grew almost insensibly out of the strong impressions received from recent accounts of the emancipated British Islands. Joseph John Gurney, well known among us as a member and minister of the Quaker denomination, was so kind as to visit me after his return from the West Indies, and then transmitted to me his "Familiar Letters to Henry Clay,"* describing a winter in those regions. The satisfaction which I felt was so great, that I could not confine it to myself. I began to write, as a man begins to talk after hearing good news. Many thoughts, connected with the topic, rushed successively into my mind; and gradually, and with little labour, this slight work took the form it now wears. I am encouraged to hope that it is of some little value from the spontaneousness of its growth.

This tract was prepared for the press some time ago, and should have been published immediately after the appearance of Mr. Gurney's letters. But I was discouraged by the pre-occupation of the minds of the whole community with the politics of the day. I was obliged to wait for the storm to pass; and I now send it forth in the hope, that some at least are at leisure to give me a short hearing. Not that I expect to be heard very widely. No one knows more than I do the want of popularity of the subject. Multitudes would think it a waste of time to give their thoughts to this great question of justice and humanity. But still there are not a few to whom the truth will be welcome. Such will find, that in these pages I am not going again over the ground which I have already travelled; and I hope they will feel, that, having begun with "Slavery," I am fitly ending with "Emancipation."

The latter part of the tract discusses a topic which I have occasionally touched on, but which needs a more full exposition, and on which I have long wished to communicate my views. The Duties of the Free States, in regard to Slavery, need to be better understood, and my suggestions I hope will be weighed with candour. As I have taken little interest for years in the politics of the day, and as my hope for the country rests not on any party, but solely on our means of education, and on moral and religious influences, I ought not to be accused of wishing to give a political aspect to the anti-slavery cause. I am very unwilling that it should take the form of a struggle for office and power. Still it has political relations; and of these I shall speak with freedom. The topic is an exciting one; but as I look at it with perfect calmness, I hope I shall not disturb the minds of others.

* The book is entitled "Familiar Letters to Henry Clay of Kentucky, describing a Winter in the West Indies. By Joseph John Gurney."

November 15, 1840.

EMANCIPATION.

At length a report of West Indian Emancipation has reached us, to which some heed will be given; and it is so cheering, that I should be glad to make it more extensively known. We have had already faithful and affecting accounts of this great social revolution; but, coming from men who bear an unpopular name, they have received little attention. Here we have the testimony of a man in no way connected with American Abolitionists. In his long residence among us, Mr. Gurney has rather shunned this party, whether justly or wisely I do not say. The fact is stated, simply to prevent or remove a prejudice from which he ought not to suffer. He came to this country on no mission from the enemies of slavery in his own land. Nor did he come as so many travellers do, to gather or invent materials for a marketable book; but to preach the gospel in obedience to what he thought a "heavenly call." In this character he visited many parts of our land, and everywhere secured esteem as a man, and won no small attention to his religious teachings. After many labours here, he felt himself charged with a divine message to the West Indies. His first object in travelling over

those islands was to preach; but in his various journeys and communications with individuals, he naturally opened his eyes and ears to the subject which there engrosses almost every thought, and in which his own philanthropy gave him special interest. In his "Letters" he furnishes us with the details and a few results of his observation, interspersed with some personal adventure, and with notices of the natural appearances and productions of regions so new and striking to an Englishman. The book has the merit of perfectly answering its end, which is not to reason about emancipation, but to make the reader a spectator, and to give him facts for his own reflection. It is written with much ease, simplicity, clearness, and sometimes with beauty. It is especially distinguished by a spirit of kindness. It not only expresses a sincere Christian philanthropy, but breathes a good humour which must disarm even the most prejudiced. They who have refused to read anti-slavery productions because steeped in gall, will find no bitter ingredients here. Not that there is a spirit of compromise or timidity in our author. He is a thoroughly kind-hearted man, and conscientiously believes that he can best serve the cause of truth and liberty by giving free utterance to his own benignant spirit. The book has not only the substantial merit of fidelity on a subject of immense importance, but another claim, which may operate more widely in its favour. It is entertaining. It does not give us dull and dry wisdom, but the quick, animated observations of a man who saw with his heart as well as his eyes, who took a strong interest in what he describes.

That the book is entirely impartial, I do not say. This highest merit of a book seems to require more

than human virtue. To see things precisely as they are, with not a shade or colouring from our own prejudices or affections, is the last triumph of self-denial. The most honest often see what they want to see; and a man so honoured as Mr. Gurney is very apt to be told what he wants to hear. But the book bears strong marks of truth. The uprightness of the author secures us against important error. Let even large deductions be made for his feelings, as a Quaker, against slavery, for his sympathy with the negro and the negro's friends. After every allowance, the great truth will come out, that the hopes of the most sanguine advocates of Emancipation have been realised, if not surpassed, in the West Indies.

Such a book is much needed. There has been in this country a backwardness, almost an unwillingness, to believe good reports from the West Indies. Not a few have desired to hear evil, and have propagated so industriously every fiction or exaggeration unfavourable to freedom, that the honest and benevolent have been misled. The general state of mind among us, in regard to West Indian Emancipation, has been disheartening. So deadly a poison has southern slavery infused into the opinions and feelings of the North, especially in the larger cities, that few cordial wishes for the success of Emancipation have met our ears. Stray rumours of the failure of the experiment in this or that island, have been trumpeted through the country by the newspapers, and the easy faith of the multitude has been practised on, till their sympathies with the oppressed have become blunted. I have myself seen the countenance of a man, not wanting in general humanity, brighten at accounts of the bad working of emancipa-

tion. In such a state of feeling and opinion, a book like Mr. Gurney's is invaluable. The truth is told simply, kindly; and, though it may receive little aid from our newspapers, must find its way into the hands of many honest readers. I offer a few extracts, not to take the place of the book, but in the hope of drawing to it more general attention. So various and interesting are the details, and so suited to the various prejudices and misapprehensions common in our country, that my only difficulty is to make a selection—to know where to stop. He first visited Tortola:—

"We could not but feel an intense interest in making our first visit to a British island, peopled with emancipated negroes. Out of a population of nearly five thousand, there are scarcely more than two hundred white persons; but we heard of no inconveniences arising from this disparity. We had letters to Dr. Dyott, the Stipendiary Magistrate, and to some of the principal planters, who greeted us with a warm welcome, and soon relieved us from our very natural anxiety, by assuring us that freedom was working well in Tortola. One of our first visits was to a school for black children, under the care of Alexander Bott, the pious minister of the Parish Church. It was in good order—the children answered our questions well. We then proceeded to the jail; in which, if my memory serves me right, we found only one prisoner, with the jailor, and the judge! Our kind friend, Francis Spencer Wigley, the Chief Justice of the British Virgin Islands, happened to be there, and cheered us with the information, that crime had vastly decreased since the period of full emancipation."—p. 25.

His next visit was to St. Christopher's:—

"I mounted one of the Governor's horses, and enjoyed a solitary ride in the country. Although it was the seventh day of the week, usually applied by the emancipated labourers to their private purposes, I observed many of them diligently at work on the cane grounds, cutting the canes for the mill. Their aspect was that of physical vigour and cheerful contentment, and all my

questions as I passed along, were answered satisfactorily. On my way, I ventured to call at one of the estates, and found it was the home of Robert Claxton, the Solicitor-General of the Colony, a gentleman of great intelligence and respectability. He was kind enough to impart a variety of useful and in general cheering information. One fact mentioned by him spoke volumes. Speaking of a small property on the island belonging to himself, he said, 'Six years ago (that is, shortly before the act of emancipation), it was worth only £2000, with the slaves upon it. Now, without a single slave, it is worth three times the money. I would not sell it for £6000.' This remarkable rise in the value of property, is by no means confined to particular estates. I was assured that, as compared with those times of depression and alarm which preceded the act of emancipation, it is at once general and very considerable. I asked the President Crook, and some other persons, whether there was a single individual on the island who wished for the restoration of slavery. Answer, 'Certainly not one.'"—p. 34.

"'They will do an *infinity* of work', said one of my informants, '*for wages.*'"

"This state of things is accompanied by a vast increase in their own comforts. Our friend Cadman, the Methodist minister, was on this station, during slavery, in the year 1826. He has now returned to it under freedom. 'The change for the better,' he observed, 'in the dress, demeanour, and welfare of the people, is *prodigious.*' The imports are vastly increased. The duties on them were £1000 more in 1838 than in 1837; and in 1839, double those of 1838, within £150. This surprising increase is owing to the demand on the part of the free labourers for imported goods, especially for articles of dress. The difficulty experienced by the gentry living in the town, in procuring fowls, eggs, &c. from the negroes, is considerably increased. The reason is well known—the labourers make use of them for home consumption. Marriage is now become frequent amongst them, and a profusion of eggs is expended on their wedding cakes! Doubtless they will soon learn to exchange these freaks of luxury for the gradual acquisition of wealth."—p. 36.

He next visited Antigua:—

"Our company was now joined by Nathaniel Gilbert, an evangelical clergyman of the Church of England, and a large proprietor and planter on the island. Both he and Sir William, the Governor, amply confirmed our previous favourable impressions respecting the state of the colony. On my inquiring of them respecting the value of landed property, their joint answer was clear and decided. 'At the lowest computation, the land, without a single slave upon it, is fully as valuable now as it was, including all the slaves, before emancipation.' In other words, the value of the slaves is already transferred to the land. Satisfactory as is this computation, I have every reason to believe that it is much below the mark. With respect to real property in the town of St. John's, it has risen in value with still greater rapidity. A large number of new stores have been opened; new houses are built or building; the streets have been cleared and improved; trade is greatly on the increase; and the whole place wears the appearance of progressive wealth and prosperity."—p. 43.

"Extensive inquiry has led us to the conviction, that on most of the properties of Antigua, and in general throughout the West Indies, one-third only of the slaves were operative. What with childhood, age, infirmity, sickness, *sham* sickness, and other causes, full two-thirds of the negro population might be regarded as dead weight.—The pecuniary saving, on many of the estates in Antigua, by the change of slave for free labour, is at least *thirty per cent.*" —pp. 45, 46.

"We had appointed a meeting at a country village called Parham. It was a morning of violent rain; but about two hundred negroes braved the weather, and united with us in public worship. It is said that they are less willing to come out to their places of worship *in the rain*, than was the case formerly. The reason is curious. They now have *shoes and stockings*, which they are unwilling to expose to the mud."—p. 47.

"It is a cheering circumstance of no small importance, that there are no less, as we were told, than *seven thousand scholars* in the various charity-schools of Antigua. In all these schools the Bible is read and taught. Who can doubt the beneficial moral effect of these extensive efforts?"—p. 48.

"The vicar of St. John's, during the last seven years of slavery, married only one hundred and ten pairs of negroes. In the single year of freedom, 1839, the number of pairs married by him, was 185.

"With respect to crime—it has been rapidly diminishing during the last few years. The numbers committed to the house of correction in 1837—chiefly for petty offences, formerly punished on the estates—were 850; in 1838 only 244; in 1839, 311. The number left in the prison at the close of 1837, was 147; at the close of 1839, only 35.

"Nor can it be doubted that the personal comforts of the labourers have been, in the meantime, vastly increased. The duties on imports in 1833 (the last year of slavery) were £13,576: in 1839, they were £24,650. This augmentation has been occasioned by the importation of dry goods and other articles, for which a demand, entirely new, has arisen among the labouring population. The quantity of bread and meat used as food by the labourers is surprisingly increased. Their wedding cakes and dinners are extravagant, even to the point, at times, of drinking champagne!

"In connection with every congregation in the island, whether of the Church of England, or among the Dissenters, has been formed a friendly society. The labourers subscribe their weekly pittances to these institutions, and draw out comfortable supplies, in case of sickness, old age, burials, and other exigencies. Thus is the negro gradually trained to the habits of prudence and foresight."

"A female proprietor who had become embarrassed, was advised to sell off part of her property in small lots. The experiment answered her warmest expectations. The labourers in the neighbourhood, bought up all the little freeholds with extreme eagerness, made their payments faithfully, and lost no time in settling on the spots which they had purchased. They soon framed their houses, and brought their gardens into useful cultivation with yams, bananas, plantains, pine-apples, and other fruits and vegetables, including plots of sugar cane. In this way Augusta and Liberta sprang up as if by magic. I visited several of the cottages, in company with the Rector of the parish, and was surprised by the excellence of the buildings, as well as by the neat furniture and cleanly little articles of daily use which we found within. It was a scene of contentment and happiness, and, I may certainly add, of industry; for these little freeholders occupied only their leisure hours in working on their own grounds. They were also earning wages as labourers on the neighbouring estates, or working at English Harbour as mechanics."—p. 49.

"We were now placed in possession of clear documentary evidence respecting the staple produce of the island. The average exports of the last five years of slavery (1829 to 1833 inclusive), were, sugar 12,189 hogsheads; molasses 3,308 puncheons; and rum 2,468 puncheons. Those of the first five years of freedom (1834 to 1838 inclusive), were, sugar 13,545 hogsheads; molasses 8,308 puncheons; and rum 1,109 puncheons: showing an excess of 1,356 hogsheads of sugar, and of 5,000 puncheons of molasses; and a diminution of 1,359 puncheons of rum. This comparison is surely a triumphant one; not only does it demonstrate the advantage derived from free labour during a course of five years, but affords a proof that many of the planters of Antigua have ceased to convert their molasses into rum. It ought to be observed that these five years of freedom included two of drought, one very calamitous. The statement for 1839 forms an admirable climax to this account. It is as follows: sugar 22,383 hogsheads (10,000 beyond the last average of slavery); 13,433 puncheons of molasses (also 10,000 beyond that average); and only 582 puncheons of rum! That, in the sixth year of freedom, after the fair trial of five years, the exports of sugar from Antigua almost doubled the average of the last five years of slavery, is a fact which precludes the necessity of all other evidence. By what hands was this vast crop raised and realised? By the hands of that lazy and impracticable race (as they have often been described), the negroes. And under what stimulus has the work been effected? Solely under that of moderate wages."—p. 53.

He next visited Dominica, of which he gives equally favourable accounts; but I hasten to make a few extracts from his notices of Jamaica, the island from which the most unfavourable reports have come, and in which the unwise and unkind measures of the proprietors, particularly in regard to rents, have done much to counteract the good influences of Emancipation:—

"We were glad to observe that the day (Sunday) was remarkably well observed at Kingston—just as it is in many of the cities of your highly favoured Union. A wonderful scene we witnessed, that morning, in Samuel Oughton's Baptist Chapel, which we

attended, without having communicated to the people any previous notice of our coming. The minister was so obliging as to make way for us on the occasion, and to invite us to hold our meeting with his flock, after the manner of Friends. Such a flock we had not before seen, consisting of nearly three thousand black people, chiefly emancipated slaves, attired after their favourite custom, in neat white raiment, and most respectable and orderly in their demeanour and appearance. They sat in silence with us, in an exemplary manner, and appeared both to understand and appreciate the doctrines of divine truth preached on the occasion. The congregation is greatly increased, both in numbers and respectability since the date of full freedom. They pour in from the country partly on foot, and partly on mules or horses of their own. They now entirely support the mission, and are enlarging their chapel at the expense of £1,000 sterling. Their subscriptions to this and other collateral objects, are at once voluntary and very liberal. 'I have brought my mite for the chapel,' said a black woman, once a slave, to S. Oughton, a day or two before our meeting; 'I am sorry it is no more:' she then put into his hand, two pieces of gold amounting to five dollars."—p. 74.

"Here it may be well to notice the fact, that the great majority of estates in Jamaica, belong to absentee proprietors, who reside in England. In Jamaica, they are placed under the care of some attorney, or representative of the owner; one attorney often undertaking the care of numerous estates. Under the attorney, is the overseer, on each particular property, on whom the management almost exclusively devolves. This state of things is extremely unfavourable to the welfare of Jamaica. If the proprietors cannot give their personal attention to their estates, it would certainly be a better plan to lease them to eligible tenants on the spot—a practice which has, of late years, been adopted in many instances. It is only surprising that estates never visited by the proprietor, and seldom by the attorney, but left to the care of inexperienced young men, often of immoral character, should prosper at all. Nor would they prosper, even as they now do, but for two causes; first, the exuberant bounty of nature; and secondly, the orderly, inoffensive conduct, and patient industry, of the negro race."—p. 85.

"The rapid diffusion of marriage among the negroes, and the

increase of it even among the white inhabitants in Jamaica, is one of the happiest results of freedom. We were assured on good authority that four times as many marriages took place last year in Jamaica, as in an equal population, on an average, in England—a fact which proves not only that numerous new connexions are formed, but also that multitudes who were formerly living as a man and wife without the right sanction, are now convinced of the sinfulness of the practice, and are availing themselves, with eagerness, of the marriage covenant. It appears that upwards of 1600 negro couples were married in the Baptist churches alone during the year 1839."—p. 86.

"In the parish (or *county*) of St. Mary, rent and wages have been arranged quite independently of each other, and labour has been suffered to find its market, without obstruction. The consequence is, that there have been no differences, and the people are working well. The quantity of work obtained from a freeman there, is far beyond the old task of the slave. In the laborious occupation of holing, the emancipated negroes perform double the work of the slave, in a day. In road-making the day's task under slavery, was to break four barrels of stone. *Now*, by task-work, a weak hand will fill eight barrels—a strong one, from ten to twelve."—p. 89.

"At the Baptist station at Sligoville, we spent several hours. It is located on a lofty hill, and is surrounded by fifty acres of fertile mountain-land. This property is divided into one hundred and fifty freehold lots, fifty of which had been already sold to the emancipated labourers, and had proved a timely refuge for many labourers who had been driven by hard usage from their former homes. Some of them had built good cottages, others temporary huts, and others again were preparing the ground for building. Their gardens were cleared, or in process of clearing, and in many cases already brought into fine cultivation. Not a hoe, I believe, had ever been driven into that land before. *Now*, a village had risen up, with every promise of comfort and prosperity, and the land was likely to produce a vast abundance of nutritious food. The people settled there were all married pairs, mostly with families, and the men employed the bulk of their time in working for wages on the neighbouring estates. The chapel and the school were immediately at hand, and the religious character of the

people stood high. Never did I witness a scene of greater industry, or one more marked by contentment for the present and hope for the future. How instructive to remember, that two years ago this peaceful village had no existence!"—p. 90.

"On our return home we visited two neighbouring estates, of about equal size, I believe, and equal fertility, both among the finest properties for natural and local advantages which I anywhere saw in Jamaica. One was in difficulty; the other all prosperity. The first was the estate already alluded to, which had been deprived of so many hands by vain attempts to compel the labour of freemen. There, if I am not mistaken, I *saw*, as we passed by, the clear marks of that violence by which the people had been expelled. The second, called 'Dawkin's Caymanas,' was under the enlightened attorneyship of Judge Bernard, who, with his lady and the respectable overseer, met us on the spot. On this property, the labourers were independent tenants. Their rent was settled according to the money value of the tenements which they occupied, and they were allowed to take their labour to the best market they could find. As a matter of course, they took it to the *home* market; and excellently were they working on the property of their old master. The attorney, the overseer, and the labourers, all seemed equally satisfied—equally at their ease. Here, then, was one property which would occasion a *bad report* of Jamaica, another which would as surely give rise to a *good report*. As it regards the properties themselves, both reports are true, and they are the respective results of two opposite modes of management.

"At Dawkin's Caymanas, we had the pleasure of witnessing an interesting spectacle; for the labourers on the property, with their wives, sons, and daughters, were on that day met at a picnic dinner. The table, of vast length, was spread under a wattled building erected for the purpose, and at the convenient hour of six in the evening, after the day's work was finished, was loaded with all sorts of good fare—soup, fish, fowls, pigs, and joints of meat in abundance. About one hundred and fifty men and women of the African race, attired with the greatest neatness, were assembled, in much harmony and order, to partake of the feast, but no drink was provided stronger than water. It was a sober, substantial repast—the festival of peace and freedom. This din-

ner was to have taken place on New Year's day; but it so happened, that a Baptist meeting-house in another part of the island had been destroyed by fire; and at the suggestion of their minister, these honest people agreed to waive their dinner, and to subscribe their money instead to the rebuilding of the meeting-house. For this purpose they raised a noble sum (I believe considerably upwards of £100 sterling); and now, in the third month of the year, finding that matters were working well with them, they thought it well to indulge themselves with their social dinner. By an unanimous vote they commissioned me to present a message of their affectionate regards to Thomas Clarkson and Thomas Fowell Buxton, the two men to whom, of all others perhaps, they were the most indebted for their present enjoyment."—pp. 91, 92.

"After breakfast we drove to Kelley's, one of Lord Sligo's properties. We saw the people on this property busily engaged in the laborious occupation of holing, a work for which ploughing is now pretty generally substituted in Jamaica. 'How are you all getting along?' said my companion to a tall, bright-looking black man, busily engaged with his hoe. 'Right well, massa, right well,' he replied. 'I am from America,' said my friend, 'where there are many slaves; what shall I say to them from you? shall I tell them that freedom is working well here?' 'Yes, massa,' said he, 'much well under freedom—thank God for it.' 'Much well' they were indeed doing, for they were earning a dollar for every hundred cane holes, a great effort certainly, but one which many of them accomplished by four o'clock in the afternoon. 'How is this?' asked the same friend, as he felt the lumps or welts on the shoulder of another man. 'Oh, massa,' cried the negro, 'I was flogged when a slave; no more whip now; all free.'" —p. 96.

"The prosperity of the planters in Jamaica must not be measured by the mere amount of the produce of sugar or coffee, as compared with the time of slavery. Even where produce is diminished, profit will be increased, if freedom be fairly tried, by the saving of expense. 'I had rather make sixty tierces of coffee,' said A. B. 'under freedom, than one hundred and twenty under slavery; such is the saving of expense, that I make a better profit by it; *nevertheless, I mean to make one hundred and twenty as before.*'"—p. 118.

"'Do you see that excellent new stone-wall round the field below us?' said the young physician to me, as we stood at A. B.'s front door, surveying the delightful scenery; 'that wall could scarcely have been built at all under slavery or the apprenticeship; the necessary labour could not have been hired at less than £5 currency, or about 13 dollars per chain. Under freedom, it cost only from 3 dollars 50 cents to 4 dollars per chain—not one-third of the amount. Still more remarkable is the fact, that the whole of it was built, under the stimulus of job-work, by an invalid negro, who during slavery had been given up to a total inaction.' This was the substance of our conversation—the information was afterwards fully confirmed by the proprietor. Such was the fresh blood infused into the veins of this decrepid person, by the genial hand of freedom, that he had been redeemed from absolute uselessness, had executed a noble work, had greatly improved his master's property, and finally, had realised for himself a handsome sum of money. This single fact is admirably and undeniably illustrative of the principles of the case; and, for that purpose, is as good as a thousand."—p. 119.

"I will take the present opportunity of offering to thy attention the account of exports from Jamaica (as exhibited in the return printed for the House of Assembly), for the last year of the apprenticeship, and the first of full freedom:—

	HHDS.
Sugar, for the year ending 9th month (Sept.) 30, 1838,....	53,825
Do. do. do. 1839,..	45,359
Apparent Diminution,.....	8,466

"This difference is much less considerable than many persons have been led to imagine; the real diminution, however, is still less, because there has lately taken place in Jamaica an increase in the size of the hogshead. Instead of the old measure, which contained 17 cwt. new ones have been introduced, containing from 20 to 22 cwt.—a change which, for several reasons, is an economical one for the planter. Allowing only 5 per cent. for this change, the deficiency is reduced from 8,466 hogsheads to 5,175; and this amount is farther lessened by the fact, that in consequence of freedom there is a vast addition to the consumption of sugar among the people of Jamaica itself, and therefore to the home sale.

"The account of coffee is not so favourable:— HHDS.

Coffee, for the year ending 9th month (Sept.) 30, 1838,...117,313
Do. do. do. do. 1839,... 78,759

Diminution (about one-third),..... 38,554

"The coffee is a very uncertain crop, and the deficiency on the comparison of these two years is not greater, I believe, than has often occurred before. We are also to remember, that both in sugar and coffee the profit to the planter may be increased by the saving of expense, even when the produce is diminished. Still, it must be allowed that some decrease has taken place on both the articles, in connection with the change of system. With regard to the year 1840, it is expected that coffee will at least maintain the last amount; but a farther decrease on sugar is generally anticipated.

"Now, so far as this decrease of produce is connected with the change of system, it is obviously to be traced to a corresponding decrease in the quantity of labour. But here comes the critical question—the real turning point: To what is this decrease in the quantity of labour owing? I answer deliberately, but without reserve, *Mainly* to causes which class under slavery and not under freedom. It is, for the most part, the result of those impolitic attempts to force the labour of freemen, which have disgusted the peasantry, and have led to the desertion of many of the estates.

"It is a cheering circumstance, that the amount of planting and other preparatory labour bestowed on the estates during the autumn of 1839, has been much greater, by all accounts, than in the autumn of 1838. This is itself the effect of an improved understanding between the planters and the peasants; and the result of it, if other circumstances be equal, cannot fail to be a considerable increase of produce in 1841. I am told, however, that there is one circumstance which may possibly prevent this result, as it regards sugar. It is, that the cultivation of it, under the old system, was forced on certain properties, which, from their situation and other circumstances, were wholly unfit for the purpose. These plantations afforded an income to the local agents, but to the proprietors were either unprofitable or losing concerns. On such properties, under those new circumstances which bring all things to their true level, the cultivation of sugar must cease.

"In the meantime, the imports of the island are rapidly increasing; trade improving; the towns thriving; new villages rising in every direction; property much enhanced in value; well-managed estates productive and profitable; expenses of management diminished; short methods of labour adopted; provisions cultivated on a larger scale than ever; and the people, wherever they are properly treated, industrious, contented, and gradually accumulating wealth."—p. 132.

"My narrative respecting the British West India islands being now brought to a close, I will take the liberty of concentrating and recapitulating the principal points of the subject, in a few distinct propositions.

"1st, *The emancipated negroes are working well on the estates of their old masters.* Nor does Jamaica, when duly inspected and fairly estimated, furnish any exception to the general result. We find that in that island, wherever the negroes are *fairly*, *kindly*, and *wisely* treated, there they are working well on the properties of their old masters; and that the existing instances of a contrary description, must be ascribed to causes which class under slavery, and not under freedom. Let it not however be imagined, that the negroes who are not working on the estates of their old masters, are on that account idle. Even these are in general busily employed in cultivating their own grounds, in various descriptions of handicraft, in lime-burning or fishing—in benefiting themselves and the community, through some new but equally desirable medium. Besides all this, stone-walls are built, new houses erected, pastures cleaned, ditches dug, meadows drained, roads made and macadamised, stores fitted up, villages formed, and other beneficial operations effected; the whole of which, before emancipation, it would have been a folly even to attempt. The old notion, that the negro is by constitution a lazy creature, who will do no work at all except by compulsion, is now for ever exploded."—p. 137.

"2d, An increased quantity of work thrown upon the market, is of course followed by the cheapening of labour."—p. 138.

"3d, *Real property has risen, and is rising in value.*—I wish it, however, to be understood, that the comparison is not here made with those olden times of slavery, when the soils of the island were in their most prolific state, and the slaves themselves of a

corresponding value; but with those days of depression and alarm, which preceded the act of emancipation. All that I mean to assert is, that landed property, in the British colonies, has touched the bottom, has found that bottom solid, has already risen considerably, and is now on a steady ascending march, towards the recovery of its highest value. One circumstance which greatly contributed to produce its depreciation, was the cry of interested persons, who wished to run it down; and the demand for it which has arisen among these very persons, is now restoring it to its rightful value. Remember the old gentleman in Antigua, who is always complaining of the effects of freedom, and *always buying land.*"—p. 139.

"4th, The personal comforts of the labouring population, under freedom, are multiplied ten-fold."—p. 140.

"5th, Lastly, the moral and religious improvement of this people, under freedom, is more than equal to the increase of their comforts. Under this head, there are three points deserving, respectively, of a distinct place in our memories. First, the rapid increase and vast extent of elementary and Christian education—schools for infants, young persons, and adults, multiplying in every direction. Secondly, the gradual but decided diminution of crime, amounting, in many country districts, almost to its extinction. Thirdly, the happy change of the general, and almost universal practice of concubinage, for the equally general adoption of marriage. 'Concubinage,' says Dr. Stewart in his letter to me, 'the universal practice of the coloured people, has wholly disappeared from amongst them. No young woman of colour thinks of forming such connections now.' What is more, the improved morality of the blacks, is reflecting itself on the white inhabitants—even the overseers are ceasing, one after another, from a sinful mode of life, and are forming reputable connections in marriage. But while these three points are confessedly of high importance, there is a *fourth*, which at once embraces and outweighs them all—I mean the diffusion of vital Christianity. I know that great apprehensions were entertained—especially in this country—lest on the cessation of slavery, the negroes should break away at once from their masters and their ministers. But freedom has come, and while their masters have not been forsaken, their religious teachers have become dearer to them than ever. Under the banner of

liberty, the churches and meeting-houses have been enlarged and multiplied, the attendance has become regular and devout, the congregations have, in many cases, been more than doubled—above all, the conversion of souls (as we have reason to believe) has been going on to an extent never before known in these colonies. In a religious point of view, as I have before hinted, the wilderness, in many places, has indeed begun to 'blossom as the rose.' 'Instead of the thorn,' *has* 'come up the fir-tree, and instead of the brier' *has* 'come up the myrtle-tree, and it shall be to the Lord for a name—for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off.'"—p. 141.

I have now given a few extracts from Mr. Gurney's book. They need no comment. Indeed, nothing can be said to convince or move the reader, if these simple records of Emancipation do not find their way to his heart. In the whole history of efforts for human happiness, it is doubtful, if another example can be found of so great a revolution accomplished with so few sacrifices, and such immediate reward. Compare with this the American Revolution, which had for its end to shake off a yoke too light to be named by the side of domestic slavery. Through what fields of blood and years of suffering, did we seek civil freedom, a boon insignificant in comparison with freedom from an owner's grasp! It is the ordinary law of Providence, that great blessings shall be gained by great sacrifices, and that the most beneficial social changes shall bring immediate suffering. That near a million of human beings should pass in a day from the deepest degradation to the rights of freemen, with so little agitation of the social system, is a fact so strange, that we naturally suspect at first some tinging of the picture from the author's sympathies; and we are brought to full conviction only by the simplicity and minuteness of his

details. For one, I should have rejoiced in Emancipation as an unspeakable good, had the immediate results worn a much darker hue. I wanted only to know that social order was preserved, that the laws were respected after Emancipation. I felt that were anarchy escaped, no evil worse than slavery could take its place. I had not forgotten the doctrine of our fathers, that human freedom was worth vast sacrifices, that it could hardly be bought at too great a price.

I proceed now to offer a few remarks on several topics suggested by Mr. Gurney's book, and I shall close by considering the duties which belong to individuals, and to the Free States in relation to slavery.

The first topic suggested by our author, and perhaps the most worthy of note, is his anxiety to show that Emancipation has been accompanied with little pecuniary loss, that as a moneyed speculation it is not to be condemned. He evidently supposes, that he is writing for a people who will judge of this grand event in history by the standard of commercial profit or loss. In this view, his simple book tells more than a thousand satires against the spirit of our times. In speaking of West Indian Emancipation, it has been common for men to say, We must wait for the facts! And what facts have they waited for? They have waited to know, that the master, after fattening many years on oppression, had lost nothing by the triumph of justice and humanity; that the slave, on being freed, was to yield as large an income as before to his employer. This delicate sensibility to the rights of the wrong-doer, this concern for property, this unconcern for human nature, is a sign of the little progress made even here by free principles, and of men's ignorance of the great end of social union.

Every good man must protest against this mode of settling the question of Emancipation. It seems to be taken for granted by not a few, that if, in consequence of this event, the crops have fallen off, or the number of coffee-bags or sugar-hogsheads is lessened, then Emancipation is to be pronounced a failure, and the great act of freeing a people from the most odious bondage, is to be set down as folly. At the North and the South this base doctrine has seized on the public mind. It runs through our presses, not excepting the more respectable. The bright promises of Emancipation are too unimportant for our newspapers; but the fearful intelligence, that this or that island has shipped fewer hogsheads of sugar than in the days of slavery, is thought worthy to be published far and wide, and Emancipation is a curse, because the civilised world must pay a few cents more to bring tea or coffee to the due degree of sweetness. It passes for an "ultraism" of philanthropy, to prize a million of human beings above as many pounds of sugar.

What is the great end of civilised society? Not coffee and sugar; not the greatest possible amount of mineral, vegetable, or animal productions; but the protection of the rights of all its members. The sacrifice of rights, especially of the dearest and most sacred, to increase of property, is one of the most flagrant crimes of the social state. That every man should have his due, not that a few proprietors should riot on the toil, sweat, and blood of the many—this is the great design of the union of men into communities. Emancipation was not meant to increase the crops, but to restore to human beings their birthright, to give to every man the free use of his powers for his own and others' good.

That the production of sugar would be diminished for a time, in consequence of Emancipation, was a thing to be expected, if not desired. It is in the sugar culture that the slaves in the West Indies have been and are most overworked. In Cuba, we are told by men who have given particular attention to that island, that the mortality on the sugar estates is ten per cent. annually, so that a whole gang is used up, swept off in ten years. Suppose Emancipation introduced into Cuba. Would not the production of sugar be diminished? Ought not every man to desire the diminution? I do not say that such atrocious cruelty was common in the British islands. But it was in this department chiefly that the slaves were exposed to excessive toil. It was to be expected, then, that when left free they would prefer other modes of industry. Accordingly, whilst the sugar is diminished, the ordinary articles of subsistence have increased. Some of the slaves have become small farmers, and many more, who hire themselves as labourers, cultivate small patches of land on their own account. There is another important consideration. Before freedom, the women formed no inconsiderable part of the gangs who laboured on the sugar crops. These are now very much if not wholly withdrawn. Is it a grief to a man, who has the spirit of a man, that woman's burdens are made lighter? Other causes of the diminution of the sugar-crop may be found in Mr. Gurney's book; but these are enough to show us, that this effect is due in part to the good working of Emancipation—to a relief of the male and female slave, in which we ought to rejoice.

Before Emancipation, I expected that the immediate result of the measure, would be more or less idleness,

and consequently a diminution of produce. How natural was it to anticipate, that men who had worked under the lash, and had looked on exemption from toil as the happiness of paradise, should surrender themselves more or less to sloth on becoming their own masters. It is the curse of a bad system to unfit men at first for a better. That the paralysing effect of slavery should continue after its extinction; that the slave should, at the first, produce less than before,—this surely is no matter of wonder. The wonder is, and it is a great one, that the slaves in the West Indies have, in their new condition, been so greatly influenced by the motives of freemen; that the spirit of industry has so far survived the system of compulsion under which they had been trained; that ideas of a better mode of living have taken so strong a hold on their minds; that so many refined tastes and wants have been so soon developed. Here is the wonder; and all this shows, what we have often heard, that the negro is more susceptible of civilization from abroad than any other race of men. That some, perhaps many of the slaves, have worked too little, is not to be denied, nor can we blame them much for it. All of us, I suspect, under like circumstances, would turn our first freedom into a holiday. Besides, when we think that they have been sweating and bleeding to nourish, in all manner of luxury, a few indolent proprietors, they do not seem very inexcusable for a short emulation of their superiors. The negro sleeping all day under the shade of the palm-tree, ought not to offend our moral sense, much more than the "owner" stretched on his ottoman or sofa. What ought to astonish us is, the limitation not the existence of the evil.

It is to be desired, that those among us who groan

over Emancipation, because the staples of the islands are diminished, should be made to wear for a few months the yoke of slavery, so as to judge experimentally whether freedom is worth or not a few hogsheads of sugar. If knowing what this yoke is, they are willing that others should bear it, they deserve themselves above all others to be crushed by it. Slavery is the greatest of wrongs, the most intolerable of all the forms of oppression. We of this country thought, that to be robbed of political liberty was an injury not to be endured; and as a people, were ready to shed our blood like water to avert it. But political liberty is of no worth compared with *personal;* and slavery robs men of the latter. Under the despotisms of modern Europe, the people, though deprived of political freedom, enjoy codes of laws constructed with great care, the fruits of the wisdom of ages, which recognise the sacredness of the rights of person and property, and under which those rights are essentially secure. A subject of these despotisms may still be a man, may better his condition, may enrich his intellect, may fill the earth with his fame. He enjoys essentially *personal* freedom, and through this accomplishes the great ends of his being. To be stripped of this blessing, to be owned by a fellow-creature, to hold our limbs and faculties as another's property, to be subject every moment to another's will, to stand in awe of another's lash, to have our whole energies chained to never-varying tasks for another's luxury, to hold wife and children at another's pleasure,—what wrong can be compared with this? This is such an insult on human nature, such an impiety towards the Common Father, that the whole earth should send up one cry of

reprobation against it; and yet we are told, this outrage must continue, lest the market of the civilised world should be deprived of some hogsheads of sugar!

It is hard to weigh human rights against each other; they are all sacred and invaluable. But there is no one which nature, instinct, makes so dear to us as the right of action, of free motion; the right of exerting, and by exertion enlarging our faculties of body and mind; the right of forming plans, of directing our powers according to our convictions of interest and duty; the right of putting forth our energies from a spring in our own breasts. Self-motion, this is what our nature hungers and thirsts for as its true element and life. In truth, everything that lives, the bird, the insect, craves and delights in freedom of action; and much more must this be the instinct of a rational moral creature of God, who can attain by such freedom alone to the proper strength and enjoyment of his nature. The rights of property or reputation are poor compared with this. Of what worth would be the products of the universe to a man forbidden to use his limbs, or shut up in a prison? To be deprived of that freedom of action which consists with others' freedom; to be forbidden to exert our faculties for our own good; to be cut off from enterprise; to have a narrow circle drawn round us, and to be kept within it by a spy and a lash; to meet an iron barrier in another's selfish will, let impulse or desire turn where it may; to be systematically denied the means of cultivating the powers which distinguish us from the brute;—this is to be wounded not only in the dearest earthly interests, but in the very life of the soul. Our humanity pines and dies rather than lives in this unnatural restraint. Now,

it is the very essence of slavery to prostrate this right of action, of self-motion, not indirectly or uncertainly, but immediately and without disguise; and is this right to be weighed in the scales against sugar and coffee? and are eight hundred thousand human beings to be robbed of it to increase the luxuries of the world?

What matters it that the staples of the West Indies are diminished? Do the people there starve? Are they driven by want to robbery? Has the negro passed from the hands of the overseer into those of the hangman? We learn from Mr. Gurney that the prophecies of ruin to the West Indies are fulfilled chiefly in regard to the prisons. These are in some places falling to decay, and everywhere have fewer inmates. And what makes this result more striking, is, that since Emancipation, many offences formerly punished summarily by the master on the plantation, now fall under the cognisance of the magistrate, and are of course punishable by imprisonment. Do the freed slaves want clothing? Do rags form the standard of Emancipation? We hear not only of decent apparel, but are told that negro vanity, hardly surpassed by that of the white dandy, suffers nothing for want of decoration or fashionable attire. There is not a sign that the people fare the worse for freedom. Enough is produced to give subsistence to an improved and cheerful population; and what more can we desire? In our sympathy with the rich proprietor, shall we complain of a change which has secured to every man his rights, and to thousands, once trodden under foot, the comforts of life and the means of intellectual and moral progress? Is it nothing, that the old unfurnished hut of the slave is in many spots giving place to the comfortable cottage? Is it

nothing, that in these cottages marriage is an indissoluble tie? that the mother presses her child to her heart as indeed her own? Is it nothing, that churches are springing up, not from the donations of the opulent, but from the hard earnings of the religious poor? What if a few owners of sugar-estates export less than formerly? Are the many always to be sacrificed to the few? Suppose the luxuries of the splendid mansion to be retrenched. Is it no compensation that the comforts of the labourer's hut are increased? Emancipation was resisted, on the ground that the slave, if restored to his rights, would fall into idleness and vagrancy, and even relapse into barbarism. But the emancipated negro discovers no indifference to the comforts of civilised life. He has wants various enough to keep him in action. His standard of living has risen. He desires a better lodging, dress, and food. He has begun, too, to thirst for accumulation. As Mr. Gurney says, "he understands his interest as well as a yankee." He is more likely to fall into the civilised man's cupidity than into the sloth and filth of a savage. Is it an offset for all these benefits, that the custom-house reports a diminution of the staples of slavery?

What a country most needs, is not an increase of its exports, but the well-being of all classes of its population, and especially of the most numerous class; and these things are not one and the same. It is a striking fact, that while the exports of the emancipated islands have decreased, the imports are greater than before. In Jamaica, during slavery, the industry of the labourers was given chiefly to a staple which was sent to absentee proprietors, who expended the proceeds very much in a luxurious life in England. At present, not

a little of this industry is employed on articles of subsistence and comfort for the working-class and their families; and, at the same time, such an amount of labour is sold by this class to the planter, and so fast are they acquiring a taste for better modes of living, that they need and can pay for great imports from the mother country. Surely, when we see the fruits of industry diffusing themselves more and more through the mass of a community, finding their way to the very hovel, and raising the multitude of men to new civilization and self-respect, we cannot grieve much, even though it should appear, that on the whole the amount of exports or even of products is decreased. It is not the quantity, but the distribution, the use of products, which determines the prosperity of a state. For example, were the grain which is now grown among us for distillation, annually destroyed by fire, or were every ship freighted with distilled liquors, to sink on approaching our shores, so that the crew might be saved, how immensely would the happiness, honour, and real strength of the country be increased by the loss, even were this not to be replaced, as it soon would be, by the springing up of a new, virtuous industry now excluded by intemperance. So, were the labour and capital now spent on the importation of pernicious luxuries, to be employed in the intellectual, moral, and religious culture of the whole people, how immense would be the gain, in every respect, though for a short time material products were diminished. A better age will look back with wonder and scorn on the misdirected industry of the present times. The only sure sign of public prosperity is, that the mass of the people are steadily multiplying the comforts of life and the means of improvement;

and where this takes place, we need not trouble ourselves about exports or products.

I am not very anxious to repel the charge against Emancipation, of diminishing the industry of the islands, though it has been much exaggerated. Allow that the freed slaves work less. Has man nothing to do but work? Are not too many here overworked? If a people can live with comfort on less toil, are they not to be envied rather than condemned? What a happiness would it be, if we here, by a new wisdom, a new temperance, and a new spirit of brotherly love, could cease to be the care-worn drudges which so many in all classes are, and could give a greater portion of life to thought, to refined social intercourse, to the enjoyment of the beauty which God spreads over the universe, to works of genius and art, to communion with our Creator? Labour connected with and aiding such a life would be noble. How much of it is thrown away on poor, superficial, degrading gratifications!

We hear the condition of Hayti deplored, because the people are so idle and produce so little for exportation. Many look back to the period, when a few planters drove thousands of slaves to the cane-field and sugar-mill, in order to enrich themselves and to secure to their families the luxurious ease so coveted in tropical climes; and they sigh over the change which has taken place. I look on the change with very different feelings. The negroes in that luxuriant island have increased to above a million. By slight toil they obtain the comforts of life. Their homes are sacred. Their little property in a good degree secure. They live together peaceably. So little inclined are they to violence, that the large amounts of specie paid by the gov-

ernment to France, as the price of independence, have been transported through the country on horseback, with comparatively no defence, and with a safety which no one would be mad enough to expect, under such circumstances, in what are called civilised lands. It is true, their enjoyments are animal in a great degree. They live much like neglected children, making little or no progress, making life one long day of unprofitable ease. I should rejoice to raise them from children into men. But when I contrast this tranquil, unoffending life with the horrors of a slave plantation, it seems to me a paradise. What matters it that they send next to no coffee or sugar to Europe? How much better, that they should stretch themselves in the heat of the day under their gracefully waving groves, than sweat and bleed under an overseer for others' selfish ease! Hayti has one curse, and that is, not freedom but tyranny. Her President for life is a despot under a less ominous name. Her government, indifferent or hostile to the improvement of the people, is sustained by a standing army, which undoubtedly is an instrument of oppression. But in so simple a form of society, despotism is not that organised robbery which has flourished in the civilised world. Undoubtedly in this rude state of things, the laws are often unwise, partial, and ill administered. I have no taste for this childish condition of society. Still I turn with pleasure from slavery to the thought of a million of fellow-beings, little instructed indeed, but enjoying ease and comfort, under that beautiful sky, and on the bosom of that exhaustless soil. In one respect Hayti is infinitely advantaged by her change of condition. Under slavery, her coloured population, that is, the mass of her inhabitants,

had no chance of rising, could make no progress in intelligence and in the arts and refinements of life. They were doomed to perpetual degradation. Under freedom their improvement is possible. They are placed within the reach of meliorating influences. Their intercourse with other nations, and the opportunities afforded to many among them of bettering their condition, furnish various means and incitements to progress. If the Catholic church, which is rendering at this moment immense aid to civilization and pure morals in Ireland, were to enter in earnest on the work of enlightening and regenerating Hayti, or if (what I should greatly prefer) any other church could have free access to the people, this island might, in a short time, become an important accession to the Christian and civilised world, and the dark cloud which hangs over the first years of her freedom would vanish before the brightness of her later history.

My maxim is, "Anything but slavery! Poverty sooner than slavery!" Suppose that we of this good city of Boston were summoned to choose between living on bread and water and such a state of things as existed in the West Indies. Suppose that the present wealth of our metropolis could be continued only on the condition, that five thousand out of our eighty thousand inhabitants should live as princes, and the rest of us be reduced to slavery to sustain the luxury of our masters. Should we not all cry out, Give us the bread and water? Would we not rather see our fair city levelled to the earth, and choose to work out slowly for ourselves and our children a better lot, than stoop our necks to the yoke? So we all feel, when the case is brought home to ourselves. What should we say to the

man, who should strive to terrify us, by prophecies of diminished products and exports, into the substitution of bondage for the character of freemen?

In the preceding remarks I have insisted that Emancipation is not to be treated as a question of profit and loss, that its merits are not to be settled by its influence on the master's gains. Mr. Gurney, however, maintains, that the master has nothing to fear, that real estate has risen, that free labour costs less than that of the slave. All this is good news and should be spread through the land; for men are especially inclined to be just, when they can serve themselves by justice. But Emancipation rests on higher ground than the master's accumulation, even on the rights and essential interests of the slave. And let these be held sacred, though the luxury of the master be retrenched.

2. I have now finished my remarks on a topic which was always present to the mind of our author—the alleged decrease of industry and exports since Emancipation. The next topic to which I shall turn, is his notice of slavery in Cuba. He only touched at this Island, but evidently received the same sad impression which we receive from those who have had longer time for observation. He says,

"Of one feature in the slave trade and slavery of Cuba, I had no knowledge until I was on the spot. The importation consists almost entirely of *men*, and we were informed that on many of the estates, not a single female is to be found. Natural increase is disregarded. The Cubans import the stronger animals, like bullocks, work them up, and then seek a fresh supply. This surely is a system of most unnatural barbarity."

This barbarity is believed to be unparalleled. The

young African, torn from home and his native shore, is brought to a plantation, where he is never to know a home. All the relations of domestic life are systematically denied him. Woman's countenance he is not to look upon. The child's voice, he is no more to hear. His owner finds it more gainful to import than to breed slaves; and, still more, has made the sad discovery, that it is cheaper to "work up" the servile labourer in his youth and to replace him by a new victim, than to let him grow old in moderate toil. I have been told by some of the most recent travellers in Cuba, who gave particular attention to the subject,* that in the sugar-making season, the slaves are generally allowed but four out of the twenty-four hours for sleep. From these too I learned, that a gang of slaves is used up in ten years. Of the young men imported from Africa, one out of ten dies yearly. To supply this enormous waste of life, above twenty-five thousand slaves are imported annually from Africa,† in vessels so crowded, that sometimes one quarter, sometimes one half of the wretched creatures perish in agony before reaching land. It is to be feared, that Cuban slavery, traced from the moment when the African touches the deck,

* My accounts from Cuba have been received from Dr. Madden and David Turnbull, Esq.; the former, one of the British commissioners, resident at Havana to enforce the treaty with Spain in relation to the slave trade; the latter, a gentleman who visited Cuba chiefly, if not solely, to inquire into slavery. Mr. Turnbull's account of Cuba, in his "Travels in the West," deserves to be read. The reports of such men, confirmed in a very important particular by Mr. Gurney, have an authority, which obliges me to speak as I have done of the slave-system of this island. If, indeed (what is most unlikely), they have fallen into errors on the subject, these can easily be exposed, and I shall rejoice in being the means of bringing out the truth.

† There are different estimates of the number, some making it much greater than the text.

to the happier moment when he finds his grave on the ocean or the plantation, includes an amount of crime and misery not to be paralleled in any portion of the globe, civilised or savage. And there are more reasons than one why I would bring this horrid picture before the minds of my countrymen. We, We, do much to sustain this system of horror and blood. The Cuban slave trade is carried on in vessels built especially for this use in American ports. These vessels often sail under the American flag, and are aided by American merchant-men, and, as is feared, by American capital. And this is not all; the sugar, in producing of which so many of our fellow-creatures perish miserably, is shipped in great quantities to this country. We are the customers, who stimulate by our demands this infernal cruelty. And knowing this, shall we become accessories to the murder of our brethren, by continuing to use the fruit of the hard-wrung toil which destroys them? The sugar of Cuba comes to us drenched with human blood. So we ought to see it and to turn from it with loathing. The guilt which produces it, ought to be put down by the spontaneous, instinctive horror of the civilised world.

There is another fact worthy attention. It is said, that most of the plantations in Cuba, which have been recently brought under cultivation, belong to Americans; that the number of American slave-holders is increasing rapidly on the Island; and consequently, that the importation of human cargoes from Africa, finds much of its encouragement from the citizens of our republic. It is not easy to speak in measured terms of this enormity. For men born and brought up amidst slavery, many apologies may be made. But men, born

beyond the sound of the lash, brought up where human rights are held sacred, who, in face of all the light thrown now on slavery, can still deal in human flesh, can become customers of the "felon" who tears the African from his native shore, and can with open eyes inflict this deepest wrong for gain and gain alone—such "have no cloak for their sin." Men so hard of heart, so steeled against the reproofs of conscience, so intent on thriving, though it be by the most cruel wrongs, are not to be touched by human expostulation and rebuke. But if any should tremble before Almighty justice, ought not *they?*

There is another reason for dwelling on this topic. It teaches us the little reliance to be placed on the impressions respecting slavery, brought home by superficial observers. We have seen what slavery is in Cuba; and yet, men of high character from this country, who have visited that island, have returned to tell us of the mildness of the system. Men, who would cut off their right hand sooner than withdraw the sympathy of others from human suffering, have virtually done so, by their representation of the kindly working of slavery on the very spot where it exists with peculiar horrors. They have visited some favoured plantation, been treated with hospitality, seen no tortures, heard no shrieks, and then come home to reprove those who set forth indignantly the wrongs of the slave. And what is true with regard to the visitors of the West Indies, applies to those who visit our southern States. Having witnessed slavery in the families of some of the most enlightened and refined inhabitants, they return to speak of it as no very fearful thing. Had they inquired about the state of society through the whole country,

and learned that more than one-fourth of the inhabitants cannot write their own names, they would have forborne to make a few selected families the representative of the community, and might have believed in the possibility of some of the horrid details recorded in "Slavery as it is." For myself, I do not think it worth my while to inquire into the merits of slavery in this or that region. It is enough for me to know, that one human being holds other human beings as his property, subject to his arbitrary and irresponsible will, and compels them to toil for his luxury and ease. I know enough of men to know what the workings of such a system on a large scale must be; and I hold my understanding insulted when men talk to me of its humanity. If there be one truth of history taught more plainly than any other, it is the tendency of human nature to abuse power. To protect ourselves against power, to keep this in perpetual check, by dividing it among many hands, by limiting its duration, by defining its action with sharp lines, by watching it jealously, by holding it responsible for abuses, this is the grand aim and benefit of the social institutions which are our chief boast. Arbitrary, unchecked power, is the evil against which all experience cries out so loudly, that apologies for it may be dismissed without a hearing. But admit the plea of its apologists. Allow slavery to be ever so humane. Grant that the man who owns me, is ever so kind. The wrong of him who presumes to talk of owning me, is too unmeasured to be softened by kindness. There are wrongs which can be redeemed by no kindness. Because a man treads on me with velvet foot, must I be content to grovel in the earth? Because he gives me meat as

well as bread, whilst he takes my child and sells it into a land where my chained limbs cannot follow, must I thank him for his kindness? I do not envy those who think slavery no very pitiable lot, provided its nakedness be covered and its hunger regularly appeased.

It is worthy of consideration, that the slave's lot does not improve with the advance of what is called civilization, that is, of trade and luxuries. Slavery is such a violation of nature, that it is an exception to the general law of progress. In rude states of society, when men's wants and employments are few, and trade and other means of gain hardly exist, the slave leads a comparatively easy life; he partakes of the general indolence. He lives in the family much as a member, and is oppressed by no great disparity of rank. But when society advances, and wants multiply, and the lust of gain springs up, and prices increase, the slave's lot grows harder. He is viewed more and more as a machine to be used for profit, and is tasked like the beast of burden. The distance between him and his master increases, and he has less and less of the spirit of a man. He may have better food, but it is that he may work the more. He may be whipped less passionately or frequently, but it is because the never varying routine of toil and the more skilful discipline which civilization teaches, have subdued him more completely. Thus, to the slave it is no gain that the community grow richer and more luxurious. He has an interest in the return of society to barbarism; for in this case he would come nearer the general level. He would escape the peculiar ignominy and accumulated burdens which he has to bear in civilised life.

3. I pass to another topic suggested by Mr. Gurney's book. What is it, let me ask, which has freed the West India slave, and is now raising him to the dignity of a man? The answer is most cheering. The great Emancipator has been Christianity. Policy, interest, state-craft, church-craft, the low motives which have originated other revolutions, have not worked here. From the times of Clarkson and Wilberforce, down to the present day, the friends of the slave, who have pleaded his cause and broken his chains, have been Christians; and it is from Christ, the divine philanthropist, from the inspiration of his cross, that they have gathered faith, hope, and love, for the conflict. This illustration of the spirit and power of Christianity, is a bright addition to the evidences of its truth. We have here the miracle of a great nation, rising in its strength, not for conquest, not to assert its own rights, but to free and elevate the most despised and injured race on earth; and as this stands alone in human history, so it recalls to us those wonderful works of mercy and power by which the divinity of our religion was at first confirmed.

It is with deep sorrow that I am compelled to turn to the contrast between religion in England and religion in America. There, it vindicates the cause of the oppressed. Here, it rivets the chain and hardens the heart of the oppressor. At the South, what is the Christian ministry doing for the slave? Teaching the rightfulness of his yoke, joining in the cry against the men who plead for his freedom, giving the sanction of God's name to the greatest offence against his children. This is the saddest view presented by the conflict with slavery. The very men, whose office it is to plead

against all wrong, to enforce the obligation of impartial, inflexible justice, to breathe the spirit of universal brotherly love, to resist at all hazards the spirit and evil customs of the world, to live and to die under the banner of Christian truth, have enlisted under the standard of slavery. Had they merely declined to bring the subject into the Church, on the ground of the presence of the slave, they would have been justified. Had they declined to discuss it through the press and in conversation, on the ground that the public mind was too furious to bear the truth, they would have been approved by multitudes; though it is wisest for the minister to resign his office, when it can only be exercised under menace and unrighteous restraint, and to go where with unsealed lips he may teach and enforce human duty in its full extent. But the ministers at the South have not been content with silence. The majority of them are understood to have given their support to slavery, to have thrown their weight into the scale of the master. That in so doing, they have belied their clear convictions, that they have preached known falsehood, we do not say. Few ministers of Christ, we trust, can teach what their deliberate judgments condemn. But in cases like the present, how common is it for the judgment to receive a shape and hue from self-interest, from private affection, from the tyranny of opinion and the passions of the multitude! Few ministers, we trust, can sin against clear, steady light. But how common is it for the mind to waver and to be obscured in regard to scorned and persecuted truth! When we look beyond the bounds of slavery, we find the civilised and Christian world with few exceptions reprobating slavery, as at war with the precepts and

spirit of Christ. But at the South, his ministers sustain it as consistent with justice, equity, and disinterested love. Can we help saying, that the loud, menacing, popular voice has proved too strong for the servants of Christ.

We hoped better things than this, because the prevalent sects at the South are the Methodists and Baptists, and these were expected to be less tainted by a worldly spirit, than other denominations in which luxury and fashion bear greater sway. But the Methodists, forgetful of their great founder, who cried aloud against slavery and spared not; and the Baptists, forgetful of the sainted name of Roger Williams, whose love of the despised Indian, and whose martyr spirit should have taught them fearless sympathy with the negro, have been found in the ranks of the foes of freedom. Indeed their allegiance to slavery seems to know no bounds. A Baptist association at the South decreed, that a slave, sold at a distance from his wife, might marry again in obedience to his master; and that he would even do wrong, to disobey in this particular. Thus one of the plainest precepts of Christianity has been set at nought. Thus the poor slave is taught to renounce his wife, however dear, to rupture the most sacred social tie, that, like the other animals, he may keep up the stock of the estate. The general Methodist Conference during this very year, have decreed, that the testimony of a coloured member of their churches should not be received against a white member, who may be on trial before an ecclesiastical tribunal. Thus in church affairs, a multitude of disciples of Jesus Christ, who have been received into Christian communion on the ground of their spiritual regeneration, who belong, as

is believed, to the church on earth and in Heaven, are put down by their brethren as incapable of recognising the obligation of truth, of performing the most common duty of morality, and are denied a privilege conceded, in worldly affairs, to the most depraved. Thus the religion of the South, heaps insult and injury on the slave.

And what have the Christians of the North done? We rejoice to say, that from these, have gone forth not a few testimonies against slavery. Not a few ministers in associations, conventions, presbyteries or conferences, have declared the inconsistency of the system with the principles of Christianity, and with the law of love. Still, the churches and congregations of the Free States have in the main looked coldly on the subject, and discouraged too effectually the free expression of thought and feeling in regard to it by the religious teacher. Under that legislation of public opinion, which, without courts or offices, sways more despotically than Czars or Sultans, the pulpit and the press have in no small degree been reduced to silence as to slavery, especially in cities, the chief seats of this invisible power. Some fervent spirits among us, seeing religion, in this and other cases, so ready to bend to worldly opinion, have been filled with indignation. They have spoken of Christianity as having no life here, as a beautiful corpse, laid out in much state, worshipped with costly homage, but worshipped very much as were the prophets, whose tombs were so ostentatiously garnished in the times of the Saviour. But this is unjust. Christianity lives and acts among us. It imposes many salutary restraints. It inspires many good deeds. There are not a few, in whom it puts forth a power,

worthy of its better days, and the number of such is growing. Let us not be ungrateful for what this religion is doing, nor shut our ears against the prophecies which the present gives of its future triumphs. Still, as a general rule, the Christianity of this day falls fearfully short of the Christianity of the immediate followers of our Lord. Then, the meaning of a Christian was, that he took the cross and followed Christ, that he counted not his life dear to him in the service of God and man, that he trod the world under his feet. Now we ask leave of the world, how far we shall follow Christ. What wrong or abuse is there which the bulk of the people may think essential to their prosperity, and may defend with outcry and menace, before which the Christianity of this age will not bow? We need a new John, who, with the untamed and solemn energy of the wilderness, shall cry out among us, Repent. We need that the Crucified should speak to us with a more startling voice, "He that forsaketh not all things, and followeth me, cannot be my disciple." We need that the all-sacrificing, all-sympathising spirit of Christianity, should cease to bow to the spirit of the world. We need that, under a deep sense of want and wo, the church should cry out, "Thy kingdom come," and with holy importunity should bring down new strength, and life, and love, from Heaven.

4. I pass to another topic, suggested by Mr. Gurney's book. According to this and all the books written on the subject, Emancipation has borne a singular testimony to the noble elements of the negro character. It may be doubted, whether any other race would have borne this trial as well as they. Before the day of

freedom came, the West Indies and this country foreboded fearful consequences from the sudden transition of such a multitude from bondage to liberty. Revenge, massacre, unbridled lust, were to usher in the grand festival of Emancipation, which was to end in the breaking out of a new Pandemonium on earth. Instead of this, the holy day of liberty was welcomed by shouts and tears of gratitude. The liberated negroes did not hasten, as Saxon serfs in like circumstances might have done, to haunts of intoxication, but to the house of God. Their rude churches were thronged. Their joy found utterance in prayers and hymns. History contains no record more touching, than the account of the religious, tender thankfulness which this vast boon awakened in the negro breast. And what followed? Was this beautiful emotion an evanescent transport, soon to give way to ferocity and vengeance? It was natural for masters, who had inflicted causeless stripes, and filled the cup of the slaves with bitterness, to fear their rage after liberation. But the overwhelming joy of freedom having subsided, they returned to labour. Not even a blow was struck in the excitement of that vast change. No violation of the peace required the interposition of the magistrate. The new relation was assumed easily, quietly, without an act of violence; and, since that time, in the short space of two years, how much have they accomplished? Beautiful villages have grown up. Little freeholds have been purchased. The marriage tie has become sacred. The child is educated. Crime has diminished. There are islands where a greater proportion of the young are trained in schools, than among the whites of the Slave States. I ask, whether any other people on the face of the

earth, would have received and used the infinite blessing of liberty so well.

The history of West Indian Emancipation teaches us, that we are holding in bondage one of the best races of the human family. The negro is among the mildest, gentlest of men. He is singularly susceptible of improvement from abroad. His children, it is said, receive more rapidly than ours the elements of knowledge. How far he can originate improvements time only can teach. His nature is affectionate, easily touched; and hence he is more open to religious impression than the white man. The European race have manifested more courage, enterprise, invention; but in the dispositions which Christianity particularly honours, how inferior are they to the African! When I cast my eyes over our Southern region, the land of Bowie knives, lynch law, and duels, of "chivalry," honour, and revenge; and when I consider that Christianity is declared to be a spirit of charity, "which seeketh not its own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, and endureth all things," and is also declared to be "the wisdom from above, which is first pure, then peaceable, gentle, easy to be entreated, full of mercy and good fruits;" can I hesitate in deciding, to which of the races in that land Christianity is most adapted, and in which its noblest disciples are most likely to be reared? It may be said, indeed, of all the European nations, that they are distinguished by qualities opposed to the spirit of Christianity; and it is one of the most remarkable events of history, that the religion of Jesus should have struck root among them. As yet it has not subdued them. The "law of honour," the strongest of all laws in the European race, is, to this day, directly hostile to

the character and word of Christ. The African carries within him, much more than we, the germs of a meek, long-suffering, loving virtue. A short residence among the negroes in the West Indies impressed me with their capacity of improvement. On all sides I heard of their religious tendencies, the noblest in human nature. I saw, too, on the plantation where I resided, a gracefulness and dignity of form and motion, rare in my own native New England. And this is the race which has been selected to be trodden down and confounded with the brutes! Undoubtedly the negroes are debased; for were slavery not debasing, I should have little quarrel with it. But let not their degradation be alleged in proof of peculiar incapacity of moral elevation. They are given to theft; but there is no peculiar aggravated guilt, in stealing from those by whom they are robbed of all their rights and their very persons. They are given to falsehood; but this is the very effect produced by oppression on the Irish peasantry. They are undoubtedly sensual; and yet the African countenance seldom shows that coarse, brutal sensuality, which is so common in the face of the white man. I should expect from the African race, if civilised, less energy, less courage, less intellectual originality than in our race, but more amiableness, tranquillity, gentleness, and content. They might not rise to an equality in outward condition, but would probably be a much happier race. There is no reason for holding such a race in chains; they need no chain to make them harmless.* .

In the remarks now made I have aimed only to express my sympathy with the wronged. As to the white

* See note at the end.

population of the South, I have no intention to disparage it. I have no undue partiality to the North; for I believe, that were northern men slave-holders, and satisfied that they could grow richer by slave than by free labour, not a few would retain their property in human flesh with as resolute and furious a grasp as their southern brethren. In truth, until the cotton culture had intoxicated the minds of the South with golden dreams, that part of the country seemed less tainted by cupidity than our own. The character of that region is still a mixed one, impulsive, passionate, vindictive, sensual; but frank, courageous, self-relying, enthusiastic, and capable of great sacrifices for a friend. Could the withering influence of Slavery be withdrawn, the Southern character, though less consistent, less based on principle, might be more attractive and lofty than that of the North. The South is fond of calling itself Anglo-Saxon. Judging from character, I should say that this name belongs much more to the North, the country of steady, persevering, unconquerable energy. Our Southern brethren remind me more of the Normans. They seem to have in their veins the burning blood of that pirate race, who spread terror through Europe, who seized part of France as a prey, and then pounced on England; a conquering, chivalrous race, from which most of the noble families of England are said to be derived. There were certainly noble traits in the Norman character, such as its enthusiasm, its defiance of peril by sea and land, its force of will, its rude sense of honour. But the man of Norman spirit, or Norman blood, should never be a slaveholder. He is the last man to profit by this relation. His pride and fierce passions need restraint, not perpetual nourish-

ment; whilst his indisposition to labour, his desire to live by others' toil, demands the stern pressure of necessity to rescue him from dishonourable sloth. Under kindlier influences he may take rank among the noblest of his race.

However, in looking at the South, the first thing which strikes my eyes is not the Anglo-Saxon or the Norman, but the Slave. I overlook the dwellings of the rich. My thoughts go to the comfortless hut of the negro. They go to the dark mass at work in the fields. That injured man is my brother, and ought not my sympathies to gather round him peculiarly? Talk not to me of the hospitality, comforts, luxuries of the planter's mansion. These are all the signs of a mighty wrong. My thoughts turn first to the slave. I would not, however, exaggerate his evils. He is not the most unhappy man on that soil. True, his powers are undeveloped; but therefore he is incapable of the guilt which others incur. He has, as we have seen, a generous nature, and his day of improvement, though long postponed, is to come. When I see by his side (and is the sight very rare?) the self-indulgent man, who, from mere love of gain and ease, extorts his sweat, I think of the fearful words which the Saviour has put into the lips of the Hebrew patriarch in the unseen world, "Thou in thy life time receivedst thy good things, and Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted and thou art tormented." Distinctions founded on wrong endure but for a day. Could we now penetrate the future world, what startling revelations would be made to us! Before the all-seeing impartial justice of God, we should see every badge of humiliation taken off from the fallen, crushed, and enslaved; and

where, where would the selfish, unfeeling oppressor appear!

5. I shall advert but to one more topic suggested by Mr. Gurney's book; I refer to the kind and respectful manner in which he speaks of many slave-holders. He has no sympathy with those, who set down this class of men indiscriminately as the chief of sinners, but speaks with satisfaction of examples of piety and virtue which he found in their number. By some among us this lenity will be ascribed to his desire to win for himself golden opinions; but he deserves no such censure. The opinion of slave-holders is of no moment to him; for he has left them forever, and returns to his own country, where his testimony to their worth will find no sympathy, but expose him to suspicion, perhaps to reproach. Of the justice of his judgment I have no doubt. Among slave-holders there may be and there are good men. But the inferences from this judgment are often false and pernicious. There is a common disposition to connect the character of the slave-holder and the character of slavery. Many at the North, who by intercourse of business or friendship have come to appreciate the good qualities of individuals at the South, are led to the secret if not uttered inference, that a system sustained by such people can be no monstrous thing. They repel indignantly the invectives of the Abolitionists against the master, and by a natural process go on to question or repel their denunciation of slavery. Here lies the secret of much of the want of just feeling in regard to this institution. People become reconciled to it in a measure by the virtues of its supporters. I will not reply to this error by insisting

that the virtues, which grow up under slavery, bear a small proportion to the vices which it feeds. I take a broader ground. I maintain that we can never argue safely from the character of a man to the system he upholds. It is a solemn truth, not yet understood as it should be, that the worst institutions may be sustained, the worst deeds performed, the most merciless cruelties inflicted by the conscientious and the good. History teaches no truth more awful, and proofs of it crowd on us from the records of the earliest and latest times. Thus, the worship of the immoral deities of heathenism was sustained by the great men of antiquity. The bloodiest and most unrighteous wars have been instigated by patriots. For ages the Jews were thought to have forfeited the rights of men, as much as the African race at the South, and were insulted, spoiled, and slain, not by mobs, but by sovereigns and prelates, who really supposed themselves avengers of the crucified Saviour. Trajan and Marcus Aurelius, men of singular humanity, doomed Christians to death, surrendering their better feelings to what they thought the safety of the State. Few names in history are more illustrious than Isabella of Castile. She was the model in most respects of a noble woman. But Isabella outstripped her age in what she thought pious zeal against heretics. Having taken lessons in her wars against the Moors, and in the extermination of the Jews, she entered fully into the spirit of the inquisition; and by her great moral power contributed more than any other sovereign to the extension of its fearful influence, and thus the horrible tortures and murders of that infernal institution, in her ill-fated country, lie very much at her door. Of all the causes which have contributed to the ruin of

Spain, the gloomy, unrelenting spirit of religious bigotry has wrought most deeply; so that the illustrious Isabella, through her zeal for religion and the salvation of her subjects, sowed the seeds of her country's ruin. It is remarkable that Spain, in her late struggle for freedom, has not produced one great man; and at this moment, the country seems threatened with disorganization; and it is to the almost universal corruption, to the want of mutual confidence, to the deep dissimulation and fraud which the spirit of the inquisition, the spirit of misguided religion, has spread through society, that this degradation must chiefly be traced. The wrongs, woes, cruelties inflicted by the religious, the conscientious, are among the most important teachings of the past. Nor has this strange mixture of good and evil ceased. Crimes to which time and usage have given sanction, are still found in neighbourhood with virtue. Examples, taken from other countries, stagger belief, but are true. Thus, in not a few regions, the infant is cast out to perish by parents who abound in tenderness to their surviving children. Our own enormities are to be understood hereafter. Slavery is not then absolved of guilt by the virtues of its supporters, nor are its wrongs on this account a whit less tolerable. The inquisition was not a whit less infernal, because sustained by Isabella. Wars are not a whit less murderous, because waged for our country's glory; nor was the slave trade less a complication of unutterable cruelties, because our fathers brought the African here to make him a Christian.

The great truth, now insisted on, that evil is evil, no matter at whose door it lies, and that men acting from conscience and religion may do nefarious deeds, needs

to be better understood, that we may not shelter ourselves or our institutions under the names of the great or the good who have passed away. It shows us, that in good company we may do the work of fiends. It teaches us how important is the culture of our whole moral and rational nature, how dangerous to rest on the old and the established without habitually and honestly seeking the truth. With these views, I believe at once that slavery is an atrocious wrong, and yet that among its upholders may be found good and pious people. I do not look on a slave country as one of the provinces of Hell. There, as elsewhere, the human spirit may hold communion with God, and it may ascend thence to Heaven. Still slavery does not lay aside its horrible nature because of the character of some of its supporters. Persecution is a cruel outrage, no matter by whom carried on, and so slavery, no matter by whom maintained, works fearful evil to bond and free. It breathes a moral taint, contaminates young and old, prostrates the dearest rights, and strengthens the cupidity, pride, love of power, and selfish sloth on which it is founded. I readily grant, that among slaveholders are to be found upright, religious men, and especially pious, gentle, disinterested, noble-minded women, who sincerely labour to be the guardians and benefactors of the slaves, and under whose kind control much comfort may be enjoyed. But we must not on this account shut our eyes on the evils of the institution, or forbear to expose them. On the contrary, this is the very reason for lifting up our voices against it; for slavery rests mainly on the virtues of its upholders. Without the sanction of good and great names it would soon die. Were it left as a monopoly to the selfish,

cruel, unprincipled, it could not stand a year. It would become in men's view as infamous as the slave trade, and be ranked among felonies. It is a solemn duty to speak plainly of wrongs which good men perpetrate. It is very easy to cry out against crimes which the laws punish, and which popular opinion has branded with infamy. What is especially demanded of the Christian is, a faithful, honest, generous testimony against enormities which are sanctioned by numbers, and fashion, and wealth, and especially by great and honoured names, and which, thus sustained, lift up their heads to Heaven, and repay rebuke with menace and indignation.

I know that there are those who consider all acknowledgment of the virtues of slaveholders as treachery to the cause of freedom. But truth is truth, and must always be spoken and trusted. To be just, is a greater work than to free slaves, or propagate religion, or save souls. I have faith in no policy but that of simplicity and godly sincerity. The crimes of good men in past times, of which I have spoken, have sprung chiefly from the disposition to sacrifice the simple primary obligations of truth, justice, and humanity, to some grand cause such as religion or country, which has dazzled and bewildered their moral sense. To free the slave, let us not wrong his master. Let us rather find comfort in the thought, that there is no unmixed evil, that a spirit of goodness mixes more or less with the worst usages, and that even slavery is illumined by the virtues of the bond and free.

I have now finished my remarks on Mr. Gurney's book, and in doing so I join with many readers in

thanking him for the good news he has reported, and in repeating his prayers for the success of Emancipation. I now proceed to a different order of considerations of great importance, and which ought always to be connected with such discussions as have now engaged us. The subject before us is not one of mere speculation. It has a practical side. There are Duties which belong to us as individuals, and as Free States, in regard to slavery. To these I now ask attention.

I begin with individuals; and their duty is, to be faithful in their testimony against this great evil, to speak their minds freely and fully, and thus to contribute what they may to the power of public opinion. It is not enough to think and feel justly. Sentiments not expressed, slumber and too often die. Utterance in some form or other is a principal duty of a social being. The chief good which an enlightened virtuous mind can do is to bring itself forth. Not a few among us have refrained from this duty, have been speechless in regard to slavery, through disapprobation of what they have called the violence of the Abolitionists. They have said, that in this rage of the elements it was fit to be still. But the storm is passing away. Abolitionism in obedience to an irresistible law of our nature, has parted with much of its original vehemence. All noble enthusiasms pass through a feverish stage, and grow wiser and more serene. Still more, the power of the Anti-slavery Association is not a little broken by internal divisions, and by its increasing reliance on political action. It has thrown away its true strength, that is, moral influence, in proportion as it has consented to mix in the frays of party. Now then, when associations are waning, it is time for the indivi-

dual to be heard, time for a free solemn protest against wrong.

It is often said, that all moral efforts to forward the abolition of slavery are futile; that to expect men to sacrifice interest to duty is a proof of insanity; that, as long as slavery is a good pecuniary speculation, the South will stand by it to the death; that whenever slave labour shall prove a drug, it will be abandoned, and not before. It is vain, we are told, to talk, reason, or remonstrate. On this ground some are anxious to bring East India cotton into competition with the Southern, that, by driving the latter from the market, the excessive stimulus to slave breeding and the profits of slave labour may cease. And is this true? Must men be starved into justice and humanity? Have truth, and religion, and conscience, no power? One thing we know, that the insanity of opposing moral influence to deep-rooted evils, has at least great names on its side. The Christian faith is the highest form of this madness and folly, and its history shows that "the foolishness of God is stronger than men." What an insult is it on the South and on human nature, to believe, that millions of slaveholders, of all ages, sexes, and conditions, in an age of freedom, intelligence, and Christian faith, are proof against all motives but the very lowest. Even in the most hardened, conscience never turns wholly to stone. Humanity never dies out among a people. After all, the most prevailing voice on earth is that of truth. Could Emancipation be extorted only by depreciation of slave labour, it would indeed be a good; but how much happier a relation would the master establish with the coloured race, if from no force but that of principle and kindness, he should set them

free? Undoubtedly at the South, as elsewhere, the majority are selfish, mercenary, corrupt; but it would be easy to find there more than "ten righteous," to find a multitude of upright, compassionate, devout minds, which if awakened from the long insensibility of habit to the evils of slavery, would soon overpower the influences of the merely selfish slaveholder.

We are told, indeed, by the South, that slavery is no concern of ours, and consequently that the less we say of it the better. What! shall the wrong-doer forbid lookers-on to speak, because the affair is a private one, in which others must not interfere? Whoever injures a man binds all men to remonstrate, especially when the injured is too weak to speak in his own behalf. Let none imagine, that by seizing a fellow-creature and setting him apart as a chattel, they can sever his ties to God or man. Spiritual connexions are not so easily broken. You may carry your victim ever so far, you may seclude him on a plantation or in a cell. But you cannot transport him beyond the sphere of human brotherhood or cut him off from his race. The great bond of humanity is the last to be dissolved. Other ties, those of family and civil society, are severed by death. This, founded as it is on what is immortal in our nature, has an everlasting sacredness, and is never broken; and every man has a right, and still more is bound, to lift up his voice against its violation.

There are many whose testimony against slavery is very much diluted by the fact of its having been so long sanctioned, not only by usage, but by law, by public force, by the forms of civil authority. They bow before numbers and prescription. But in an age of inquiry and innovation, when other institutions must

make good their title to continuance, it is a suspicious tenderness, which fears to touch a heavy yoke, because it has grown by time into the necks of our fellow-creatures. Do we not know that unjust monopolies, cruel prejudices, barbarous punishments, oppressive institutions, have been upheld by law for ages? Majorities are prone to think that they can create right by vote, and can legalise gainful crimes by calling the forms of justice to their support. But these conspiracies against humanity, these insults offered to the majesty and immutableness of truth and rectitude, are the last forms of wickedness to be spared. Selfish men, by combining into a majority, cannot change tyranny into right. The whole earth may cry out, that this or that man was made to be owned and used as a chattel, or a brute, by his brother. But his birthright as a man, as a rational creature of God, cleaves to him untouched by the clamour. Crimes, exalted into laws, become therefore the more odious, just as the false gods of heathenism, when set up of old on the altar of Jehovah, shocked his true worshippers the more, by usurping so conspicuously the honours due to him alone.

It is important, that we should each of us bear our conscientious testimony against slavery, not only to swell that tide of public opinion, which is to sweep it away, but that we may save ourselves from sinking into silent, unsuspected acquiescence in the evil. A constant resistance is needed to this downward tendency, as is proved by the tone of feeling in the Free States. What is more common among ourselves than a courteous, apologetic disapprobation of slavery, which differs little from taking its part. This is one of its worst influences. It taints the whole country. The existence,

the perpetual presence of a great, prosperous, unrestrained system of wrong in a community, is one of the sorest trials to the moral sense of the people, and needs to be earnestly withstood. The idea of justice becomes unconsciously obscured in our minds. Our hearts become more or less seared to wrong. The South says, that slavery is nothing to us at the North. But through our trade we are brought into constant contact with it; we grow familiar with it; still more, we thrive by it; and the next step is easy, to consent to the sacrifice of human beings, by whom we prosper. The dead know not their want of life, and so a people, whose moral sentiments are palsied by the interweaving of all their interests with a system of oppression, become degraded without suspecting it. In consequence of this connection with slave countries, the Idea of Human Rights, that great idea of our age, and on which we profess to build our institutions, is darkened, weakened among us, so as to be to many little more than a sound. A country of licensed, legalised wrongs, is not the atmosphere in which the sentiment of reverence for these rights can exist in full power. In such a community, there may be a respect for the arbitrary rights, which law creates and may destroy, and a respect for historical rights, which rest on usage. But the fundamental rights which inhere in man as man, and which lie at the foundation of a just, equitable, beneficent, noble polity, must be imperfectly comprehended. This depression of moral sentiment in a people is an evil, the extent of which is not easily apprehended. It affects and degrades every relation of life. Men, in whose sight human nature is stripped of all its rights and dignity, cannot love or honour any who possess it, as they ought. In offering

these remarks I do not forget what I rejoice to know, that there is much moral feeling among us in regard to slavery. But still there is a strong tendency to indifference, and to something worse; and on this account we owe it to our own moral health, and to the moral life of society, to express plainly and strongly our moral abhorrence of this institution.

This duty is rendered more urgent by the depraving tendency of our political connections and agitations. It has been said much too sweepingly, but with some approximation to truth, that in this country we have hosts of politicians, but no statesmen; meaning by the latter term, men of comprehensive, far-reaching views, who study the permanent good of the community, and hold fast under all changes, to the great principles on which its salvation rests. The generality of our public men are mere politicians, purblind to the future, fevered by the present, merging patriotism in party spirit, intent on carrying a vote or election, no matter what means they use or what precedents they establish, and holding themselves absolved from a strict morality in public affairs. A principal object of political tactics is to conciliate and gain over to one or another side the most important interests of the country; and, of consequence, the slave interest is propitiated with no small care. No party can afford to lose the South. The master's vote is too precious to be hazarded by sympathy with the slaves. Accordingly, parties and office-seekers wash their hands of abolitionism as if it were treason, and without committing themselves to slavery, protest their innocence of hostility to it. How far they would bow to the slave power, were the success of a great election to depend on soothing it, cannot be

foretold, especially since we have seen the party, most jealous of popular rights, surrendering to this power the right of petition. In this state of things the slave-holding interest has the floor of Congress very much to itself. Now and then a man of moral heroism meets it with erect front, and a tone of conscious superiority. But political life does not abound in men of heroic mould. Military heroes may be found in swarms. Thousands die fearlessly on the field of battle, or the field of "honour." But the moral courage, which can stand cold looks, frowns, and contempt, which asks counsel of higher oracles than people or rulers, and cheerfully gives up preferment to a just cause, is rare enough to be canonised. In such a country the tendency to corruption of moral sentiment in regard to slavery, is strong. Many are tempted to acquiescence in it; and of consequence the good man, the friend of humanity and his country, should meet the danger by strong, uncompromising reprobation of this great wrong.

I would close this topic with observing, that there is one portion of the community, to which I would especially commend the cause of the enslaved, and the duty of open testimony against this form of oppression; and that is, our women. To them above all others, slavery should seem an intolerable evil, because its chief victims are women. In their own country, and not very far from them, there are great multitudes of their sex exposed to dishonour, held as property by *man*, unprotected by law, driven to the field by the overseer, and happy if not consigned to infinitely baser uses, denied the rights of wife and mother, and liable to be stripped of husband and child when another's pleasure or interest may so determine. Such is the lot

of hundreds of thousands of their sisters; and is there nothing here to stir up woman's sympathy, nothing for her to remember when she approaches God's throne or opens her heart to her fellow-creatures? Woman should talk of the enslaved to her husband, and do what she can to awaken, amongst his ever-thronging worldly cares, some manly indignation, some interest in human freedom. She should breathe into her son a deep sense of the wrongs which man inflicts on man, and send him forth from her arms, a friend of the weak and injured. She should look on her daughter, and shudder at the doom of so many daughters on her own shores. When she meets with woman, she should talk with her of the ten thousand homes which have no defence against licentiousness, against violation of the most sacred domestic ties; and through her whole intercourse, the fit season should be chosen to give strength to that deep moral conviction which can alone overcome this tremendous evil.

I know it will be said, that in thus doing, woman will wander beyond her sphere, and forsake her proper work. What! Do I hear such language in a civilised age, and in a land of Christians. What, let me ask, is woman's work? It is to be a minister of Christian love. It is to sympathise with human misery. It is to breathe sympathy into man's heart. It is to keep alive in society some feeling of human brotherhood. This is her mission on earth. Woman's sphere, I am told, is home. And why is home instituted? Why are domestic relations ordained? These relations are for a day; they cease at the grave. And what is their great end? To nourish a love which will endure forever, to awaken universal sympathy. Our ties to our

parents are to bind us to the Universal Parent. Our fraternal bonds to help us to see in all men our brethren. Home is to be a nursery of Christians; and what is the end of Christianity but to awaken in all souls the principles of universal justice and universal charity. At home we are to learn to love our neighbour, our enemy, the stranger, the poor, the oppressed. If home do not train us to this, then it is wofully perverted. If home counteract and quench the spirit of Christianity, then we must remember the Divine Teacher who commands us to forsake father and mother, brother and sister, wife and child, for His sake, and for the sake of his truth. If the walls of home are the bulwarks of a narrow, clannish love, through which the cry of human miseries and wrongs cannot penetrate, then it is mockery to talk of their sacredness. Domestic life is at present too much in hostility to the spirit of Christ. A family should be a community of dear friends, strengthening one another for the service of their fellow-creatures. Can we give the name of Christian to most of our families? Can we give it to women, who have no thoughts or sympathies for multitudes of their own sex, distant only two or three days' journey from their doors, and exposed to outrages, from which they would pray to have their own daughters snatched, though it were by death?

Having spoken of the individual, I proceed to speak of the duties of the Free States, in their political capacity, in regard to slavery; and these may be reduced to two heads, both of them negative. The first is, to abstain as rigidly from the use of political power against slavery in the States where it is established, as from

exercising it against slavery in foreign communities. The second is, to free ourselves from all obligation to use the powers of the national or state governments in any manner whatever for the support of slavery.

The first duty is clear. In regard to slavery, the Southern states stand on the ground of foreign communities. They are not subject or responsible to us more than these. No state-sovereignty can intermeddle with the institutions of another. We might as legitimately spread our legislation over the schools, churches, or persons of the South, as over their slaves. And in regard to the General Government, we know that it was not intended to confer any power, direct or indirect, on the free, over the slave states. Any pretension to such power on the part of the North, would have dissolved immediately the convention which framed the constitution. Any act of the Free States, when assembled in Congress, for the abolition of slavery in other States, would be a violation of the national compact, and would be just cause of complaint.

On this account I cannot but regret the disposition of a part of our abolitionists to organise themselves into a political party. Were it indeed their simple purpose to free the North from all obligation to give support to slavery, I should agree with them in their end, though not in their means. By looking, as they do, to political organization, as a means of putting down the institution in other States, they lay themselves open to reproach. I know, indeed, that excellent men are engaged in this movement, and I acquit them of all disposition to transcend the limits of the Federal Constitution. But it is to be feared, that they may construe this instrument too literally; that, forgetting its

spirit, they may seek to use its powers for purposes very remote from its original design. Their failure is almost inevitable. By extending their agency beyond its true bounds, they ensure its defeat in its legitimate sphere. By assuming a political character, they lose the reputation of honest enthusiasts, and come to be considered as hypocritical seekers after place and power. Should they, in opposition to all probability, become a formidable party, they would unite the slave-holding states as one man; and the South, always able, when so united, to link with itself a party at the North, would rule the country as before.

No association, like the abolitionists, formed for a particular end, can, by becoming a political organization, rise to power. If it can contrive to perpetuate itself, it will provoke contempt by the disproportion of its means to its ends; but the probability is, that it will be swallowed up in the whirlpool of one or the other of the great national parties, from whose fury hardly any thing escapes. These mighty forces sweep all lesser political organizations before them. And these are to be robbed of their pernicious power, not by forming a third party, but by the increase of intelligence and virtue in the community, and by the silent flowing together of reflecting, upright, independent men, who will feel themselves bound to throw off the shackles of party; who will refuse any longer to neutralise their moral influence by coalition with the self-seeking, the hollow-hearted, and the double-tongued; whose bond of union will be, the solemn purpose to speak the truth without adulteration, to adhere to the right without compromise, to support good measures and discountenance bad, come from what quarter they

I
70573

may, to be just to all parties, and to expose alike the corruptions of all. There are now among us good and true men enough to turn the balance on all great questions, would they but confide in principle, and be loyal to it in word and deed. Under their influence, newspapers might be established, in which men and measures of all parties would be tried without fear or favour, by the moral, Christian law; and this revolution of the press would do more than all things for the political regeneration of the country. The people would learn from it, that whilst boasting of liberty, they are used as puppets and tools; that popular sovereignty, with all its paper bulwarks, is a show rather than a substance, as long as party despotism endures. It is by such a broad, generous improvement of society, that our present political organizations are to be put down, and not by a third party on a narrow basis, and which, instead of embracing all the interests of the country, confines itself to a single point.

I cannot but express again regret at the willingness of the abolitionists to rely on and pursue political power. Their strength has always lain in the simplicity of their religious trust, in their confidence in Christian truth. Formerly, the hope sometimes crossed my mind, that, by enlarging their views and purifying their spirit, they would gradually become a religious community, founded on the recognition of God as the common, equal Father of all mankind, on the recognition of Jesus Christ as having lived and died to unite to himself and to baptise with his spirit every human soul, and on the recognition of the brotherhood of all the members of God's human family. There are signs that Christians are tending, however slowly,

toward a church, in which these great ideas of Christianity will be realised; in which a spiritual reverence for God, and for the human soul, will take place of the customary homage paid to outward distinctions; and in which our present narrow sects will be swallowed up. I thought that I saw in the principles with which the abolitionists started, a struggling of the human mind toward this Christian union. It is truly a disappointment to see so many of their number becoming a political party, an association almost always corrupting, and most justly suspected on account of the sacrifices of truth, and honour, and moral independence, which it extorts even from well-disposed men. Their proper work is to act on all parties, to support each as far as it shall be true to human rights, to gather labourers for the good cause from all bodies, civil and religious, and to hold forth this cause as a universal interest, and not as the property or stepping-stone of a narrow association.

I know that it is said, that nothing but this political action can put down slavery. Then slavery must continue; and if we faithfully do our part as Christians, we are not responsible for its continuance. We are not to feel, as if we were bound to put it down by any and every means. We do not speak as Christians, when we say that slavery *must* and *shall* fall. Who are we to dictate thus to omnipotence? It has pleased the mysterious providence of God, that terrible evils should be left to overshadow the earth for ages. "How long, O Lord!" has been the secret cry extorted from good men by the crimes of the world for six thousand years. On the philanthropist of this age, the same sad burden is laid, and it cannot be removed. We must not feel,

that were slavery destroyed, paradise would be restored. As in our own souls the conquest of one evil passion reveals to us new spiritual foes, so in society, one great evil hides in its shadow others perhaps as fearful, and its fall only summons us to new efforts for the redemption of the race. We know, indeed, that good is to triumph over evil in this world; that "Christ must reign, till he shall put all enemies beneath his feet," or until his Spirit shall triumph over the spirit, oppressions, corruptions of the world. Let us, then, work against all wrong, but with a calm, solemn earnestness, not with vehemence and tumult. Let us work with deep reverence and filial trust toward God, and not in the proud impetuosity of our own wills. Happy the day, when such labourers shall be gathered by an inward attraction into one church or brotherhood, whose badge, creed, spirit, shall be Universal Love. This will be the true kingdom of God on earth, and its might will infinitely transcend political power.

For one, I have no desire to force Emancipation on the South. Had I political power, I should fear to use it in such a cause. A forced Emancipation is, on the whole, working well in the West Indies, because the mother country watches over and guides it, and pours in abundantly moral and religious influences to calm, and enlighten, and soften the minds newly set free. Here no such control can be exercised. Freedom at the South, to work well, must be the gift of the masters. Emancipation must be their own act and deed. It must spring from good-will and sense of justice, or at least from a sense of interest, and not be extorted by a foreign power; and with this origin, it will be more successful even than the experiment in the West Indies.

In those islands, especially in Jamaica, the want of cordial co-operation on the part of the planters, has continually obstructed the beneficial working of freedom, and still throws a doubtfulness over its complete success.

I have said that the free States cannot rightfully use the power of their own legislatures or of Congress, to abolish slavery in the States where it is established. Their first duty is to abstain from such acts. Their next and more solemn duty is to abstain from all action for the support of slavery. If they are not to subvert, much less are they to sustain it. There is some excuse for communities, when, under a generous impulse, they espouse the cause of the oppressed in other states, and by force restore their rights; but they are without excuse in aiding other states in binding on men an unrighteous yoke. On this subject, our fathers, in framing the Constitution, swerved from the right. We, their children, at the end of half a century, see the path of duty more clearly than they, and must walk in it. To this point the public mind has long been tending, and the time has come for looking at it fully, dispassionately, and with manly and Christian resolution. This is not a question of Abolitionism. It has nothing to do with putting down slavery. We are simply called as communities, to withhold support from it, to stand aloof, to break off all connection with this criminal institution. The free States ought to say to the South, "Slavery is yours, not ours, and on you the whole responsibility of it must fall. We wash our hands of it wholly. We shall exert no power against it; but do not call on us to put forth the least power in its behalf. We cannot, directly or indirectly, become accessories

to this wrong. We cannot become jailers, or a patrol, or a watch, to keep your slaves under the yoke. You must guard them yourselves. If they escape, we cannot send them back. Our soil makes whoever touches it, free. On this point you must manage your own concerns. You must guard your own frontier. In case of insurrection we cannot come to you, save as friends alike of bond and free. Neither in our separate legislatures nor in the national legislature, can we touch slavery to sustain it. On this point you are foreign communities. You have often said, that you need not our protection; and we must take you at your word. In so doing, we have no thought of acting on your fears. We think only of our duty, and this, in all circumstances, and at all hazards, must be done."

The people of the North think but little of the extent of the support given to slavery by the Federal Government; though, when it is considered that "the slave-holding interest has a representation in Congress of *twenty-five* members, in *addition* to the fair and equal representation of the free inhabitants," it is very natural to expect the exercise of the powers of Congress in behalf of this institution. The Federal Government has been and is the friend of the slave-holder, and the enemy of the slave. It authorises the former to seize, in a free State, a coloured man, on the ground of being a fugitive, and to bring him before a justice of peace of his own selection; and this magistrate, without a jury, or without obligation to receive any testimony but what the professed master offers, can deliver up the accused, to be held as property for life. The Federal Government authorises not only the apprehension and imprisonment, in the District of Columbia, of a

negro suspected of being a runaway, but the sale of him as a slave, if within a certain time he cannot prove his freedom. It sustains slavery within the District of Columbia, though "under its exclusive jurisdiction," and allows this district to be one of the chief slave-marts of the country. Not a slave auction is held there but by the authority of Congress. The Federal Government has endeavoured to obtain, by negociation, the restoration of fugitive slaves who have sought and found freedom in Canada, and has offered in return to restore fugitives from the West Indies. It has disgraced itself in the sight of all Europe, by claiming, as property, slaves who have been shipwrecked on the British islands, and who, by touching British soil, had become free. It has instructed its representative at Madrid, to announce to the Spanish court, "that the Emancipation of the slave population of Cuba would be very severely felt in the adjacent shores of the United States." It has purchased a vast unsettled territory, which it has given up to be overrun with slavery. To crown all, it has, in violation of the constitution, and of the right granted even by despotism to its subjects, refused to listen to petitions against these abuses of power. After all this humbling experience, is it not time for the free States to pause, to reflect, to weigh well what they are doing through the national government, and to resolve that they will free themselves from every obligation to uphold an institution which they know to be unjust?*

The object now proposed, is to be effected by amend-

* On the subject of this paragraph, the reader will do well to consult "A View of the Action of the Federal Government in behalf of Slavery, by William Jay." The author is a son of Chief Justice Jay, and a worthy representative of the spirit and principles of his illustrious father.

ments of the Constitution, and these should be sought in good faith; that is, not as the means of abolishing slavery, but as a means of removing us from a participation of its guilt. The free States should take the high ground of duty; and to raise them to this height, the press, the pulpit, and all religious and upright men should join their powers. A people under so pure an impulse, cannot fail. Such arrangements should be made, that the word slavery need not be heard again in Congress or in the local legislatures. On the principle now laid down, the question of abolition in the District of Columbia should be settled. Emancipation at the seat of Government ought to be insisted on, not for the purpose of influencing slavery elsewhere, but because what is done there, is done by the whole people, because slavery sustained there, is sustained by the free States. It is said, that the will of the citizens of the District is to be consulted. Were this true, which cannot be granted, the difficulty may easily be surmounted. Let Congress resolve to establish itself where it will have no slavery to control or uphold, and the people of the District of Columbia will remove the obstacle to its continuance where it is, as fast as can be desired.

The great difficulty in the way of the arrangement now proposed, is the article of the Constitution requiring the surrender and return of fugitive slaves. A State, obeying this, seems to me to contract as great guilt as if it were to bring slaves from Africa. No man, who regards slavery as among the greatest wrongs, can in any way reduce his fellow-creatures to it. The flying slave asserts the first right of a man, and should meet aid rather than obstruction. Who that has the heart

of a freeman, or breathes the love of a Christian, can send him back to his chain? On this point, however, the difficulty of an arrangement is every day growing less. This provision of the Constitution is undergoing a silent repeal, and no human power can sustain it. Just in proportion as slavery becomes the object of conscientious reprobation in the Free States, just so fast the difficulty of sending back the fugitive increases. In the part of the country where I reside, it is next to impossible that the slave, who has reached us, should be restored to bondage. Not that our courts of law are obstructed; not that mobs would rescue the fugitive from the magistrate. We respect the public authorities. Not an arm would be raised against the officers of justice. But what are laws against the moral sense of a community? No man among us, who values his character, would aid the slave-hunter. The slave-hunter here would be looked on with as little favour as the felonious slave-trader. Those among us, who dread to touch slavery in its own region, lest insurrection and tumults should follow change, still feel, that the fugitive who has sought shelter so far, can breed no tumult in the land which he has left, and that, of consequence, no motive but the unhallowed love of gain can prompt to his pursuit; and when they think of slavery as perpetuated, not for public order, but for gain, they abhor it, and would not lift a finger to replace the flying bondsman beneath the yoke. Thus this provision of the Constitution is virtually fading away; and, as I have said, no human power can restore it. The moral sentiment of a community is not to be withstood. Make as many Constitutions as you will; fence round your laws with what penalties you will; the

universal conscience makes them as weak as the threats of childhood. There is a spirit spreading through the country in regard to slavery, which demands changes of the constitution, and which will master if it cannot change it. No concerted opposition to this instrument is thought of or is needed. No secret understanding among our citizens is to be feared at the South. The simple presence to their minds of the great truth, that man cannot rightfully be the property of man, is enough to shelter the slave. With this conviction we are palsy-stricken, when called upon to restore him to bondage. Our sinews are relaxed; our hands hang down; our limbs will not carry us a step. Now this conviction is spreading, and will become the established principle of the free States. Politicians, indeed, to answer a party end, may talk of property in man, as something established or not to be questioned; but the people at large do not follow them. The people go with the civilised and Christian world. The South should understand this, should look the difficulty in the face; and they will see that, from the nature of the case, resistance is idle, that neither policy nor violence can avail. And, what is more, they have no right to reproach us with letting this provision of the constitution die among us. *They* have done worse. *We* are passive. *They* have actively, openly, flagrantly violated the constitution. They have passed laws, threatening to imprison and punish the free coloured citizens of the North for exercising the rights guaranteed to every citizen by the national compact, *i. e.* for setting foot on their shores and using their highways. This wrong has been too patiently borne; and in one way we can turn it to good account. When reproached

with unfaithfulness to the constitution, we can hold it up as our shield, and cite the greater disloyalty of the South as an extenuation of our own.

It is best, however, that neither party should be unfaithful. It is best that both, enlightened as to the spirit of our times, should make new arrangements to prevent collision, to define the duties of each and all, to bring the constitution into harmony with the moral convictions and with the safety of North and South. Until some such arrangements are made, perpetual collisions between the two great sections of our country must occur. Notwithstanding the tendencies to a low tone of thought and feeling at the North in regard to slavery, there is a decided increase of moral sensibility on the subject; and in proportion as this shall spread, the free States will insist more strenuously on being released from every obligation to give support to what they deliberately condemn.

This liberation of the free States from all connection with and action on slavery, would indeed be an immense boon, and the removal of much dissension. Still, the root of bitterness would remain among us. Still, our union, that inestimable political good, will be insecure. Slavery, whilst it continues, must secretly, if not openly, mix with our policy, sow jealousies, determine the character of parties, and create, if not diversities of interests, at least suspicions of them, which may prove not a whit the less ruinous, because groundless.

Slavery is unfriendly to union, as it is directly hostile to the fundamental principle on which all our institutions rest. No nation can admit an element at war with its vital, central law, without losing something

of its stability. The idea of Human Rights is the grand distinction of our country. Our chief boast as a people, is found in the fact, that the toils, sacrifices, heroic deeds of our fathers, had for their end the establishment of these. Here is the unity which sums up our history; the glory which lights up our land, the chief foundation of the sentiment of loyalty, the chief spring of national feeling, the grand bond of national union; and whatever among us is at war with this principle, weakens the living force which holds us together.

On this topic I cannot enlarge. But recent events compel me to refer to one influence more, by which slavery is unfriendly to union. It aggravates those traits of character at the South, which tend to division. It inflames that proud, fiery spirit, which is quick to take offence, and which rushes into rash and reckless courses. This ungoverned violence of feeling breaks out especially in Congress, the centre from which impulses are communicated to the whole people. It is a painful thought, that if any spot in the country is pre-eminent for rudeness and fierceness, it is the Hall of Representatives. Too many of our legislators seem to lay down at its door the common restraints of good society and the character of gentlemen. The national chamber seems liable to become a national nuisance; and, although all parts of the country are in a measure responsible for this wound inflicted on the honour and union of the country, we do feel, that the evil is to be imputed chiefly to the proud, impetuous temper of the South. It is believed, that the personal violences, which, if repeated, will reduce the national council to the level of a boxing-match, may be traced to that part of the country. This evil is too notorious to be sof-

tened down by apologies or explanations; nor is it less an evil because precedents and parallels can be found in the legislative bodies of France and England. It tends not merely to spread barbarism through the community, but to impair the authority of legislation, to give new ferocity to the conflicts of party, and thus to weaken the national tie.

If slavery, that brand of discord, were taken away, the peculiarities of Northern and Southern character would threaten little or no evil to the Union. On the contrary, these two grand divisions of the country, now estranged from each other, would be brought near, and, by acting on and modifying one another, would produce a national character of the highest order. The South, with more of ardour and of bold and rapid genius, and the North, with more of wisdom and steady principle, furnish admirable materials for a State. Nor is the union of these to a considerable degree impracticable. It is worthy of remark, that the most eminent men at the South have had a large infusion of the Northern character. Washington, in his calm dignity, his rigid order, his close attention to business, his reserve almost approaching coldness, bore a striking affinity to the North; and his sympathies led him to choose Northern men very much as his confidential friends. Mr. Madison had much of the calm wisdom, the patient, studious research, the exactness and quiet manner of our part of the country, with little of the imagination and fervour of his own. Chief Justice Marshall had more than these two great men of the genial unreserved character of a warmer climate, but so blended with a spirit of moderation, and clear judgment, and serene wisdom, as to make him the delight and confidence of

the whole land. There is one other distinguished name of the South, which I have not mentioned, Mr. Jefferson; and the reason is, that his character seemed to belong to neither section of the country. He wanted the fiery, daring spirit of the South, and the calm energy of the North. He stood alone. He was a man of genius, given to bold, original, and somewhat visionary speculation, and at the same time, a sagacious observer of men and events. He owed his vast influence, second only to Washington's, to his keen insight into the character of his countrymen and into the spirit of his age. His opponents have set him down as the most unscrupulous of politicians; but one merit, and no mean one, must be accorded to him, that of having adopted early, and of having held fast through life, the most generous theory of Human Rights, and of having protested against slavery, as an aggravated wrong. In truth, it is impossible to study the great men of the South, and to consider the force of intellect and character which that region has developed, without feelings of respect, and without the most ardent desire that it may free itself by any means from an institution, which aggravates what is evil and threatening in its character, which cripples it of much of its energy, which cuts it off from the sympathies and honour of the civilised world, and which prevents it from a true cordial union with the rest of the country. It is slavery which prevents the two sections of country from acting on and modifying each other for the good of both. This is the great gulf between us, and constantly growing wider and deeper in proportion to the spread of moral feeling, of Christian philanthropy, of respect for men's rights, of interest in the oppressed.

Why is it, that slavery is not thrown off? We here ascribe its continuance very much to cupidity and love of power. But there is another cause which is certainly disappearing. Slavery at the South continues, in part, in consequence of that want of activity, of steady force, of resolute industry among the free white population, which it has itself produced. A people with force enough to attempt a social revolution, and to bear its first inconveniences, would not endure slavery. We of the North, with our characteristic energy, would hardly tolerate it a year. The sluggishness, stupidity of the slaves would keep us in perpetual irritation. We should run over them, tread them almost unconsciously under foot, in our haste and eagerness to accomplish our enterprises. We should feel the wastefulness of slave labour, in comparison with free. The clumsy mechanic, the lagging house-servant, the slovenly labourer, ever ready with a lying excuse, would be too much for our patience. Now, there is reason to think, that the stirring, earnest, industrious spirit of the North, is finding its way Southward; and with this, a desire to introduce better social relations can hardly be repressed.

We believe, too, that this revolution would be hastened, if the South would open its ear to the working of Emancipation in other countries, and to the deep interest in the African race which is now spreading through the world. On these subjects very little is yet known at the South. The newspapers there spread absurd rumours of the failure of the experiment of the West Indies, but the truth finds no organs. We doubt, too, whether one newspaper has even made a reference to the recent public meeting in England for the civilization of Africa, the most remarkable, in one respect,

ever held in that country, for it was a representation of all ranks and sects, including the greatest names in church and state, and, what was not less venerable, a multitude of both sexes, who have made themselves dear and honoured by services to humanity. Whoever considers this, and other signs of the times in Europe, will see the dawn of a better era, when the wrongs of past ages are to be redressed, when the African is to be lifted up, and the sentence of moral outlawry is to be passed on the enslavers of their brethren. Many among us are apt to smile and say, that nations have but one law, self-interest. But a new and higher force is beginning to act on human affairs. Religion is becoming an active, diffusive, unwearied principle of humanity and justice. All the forces of Christianity are concentrating themselves, into a fervent, all-comprehending philanthropy. This is at length to be understood at the South, and it will be felt there. In that region, there are pious men and women who will not endure to be cut off from the religious communion of the world. There are self-respecting men, brave enough to defy all personal danger, but not to defy the moral sentiment of mankind. There are the wise and good, who will rejoice to learn, that Emancipation brings dignity and happiness to the slave, and safety and honour to the free. Here is power enough to put down the selfish and unprincipled. Here are influences, which, joined with favouring events from God's good providence, are, we trust, to remove the wrongs and evils of slavery, and to give us a right to hold up our head among Christian nations.

But if it is not ordained, that, by these and like influences, this great wrong is to be done away, of one

thing we are sure, that God's righteous providence lacks not means for accomplishing his designs. He has infinite ministers, for humbling human pride and lifting up the fallen. The solemn lesson of our times is the instability of all human power. Despotic thrones have fallen, and surely private despotism cannot endure. We learn from history, that, in seasons apparently the most inauspicious, the seeds of beneficent revolutions have been sown, and have unfolded in silence. Much more, in these days of change and progress, causes must be at work for the redemption of the slave. Emancipation, universal freedom, must come. May God prepare its way, not by earthquakes and storms, but by "the still, small voice" of truth, by breathing into the hearts of this people the spirit of wisdom, justice, and love.

It is a solemn thought, with which I close these remarks, that a people, upholding, or in any way giving countenance to slavery, contract guilt in proportion to the light which is thrown on the injustice and evils of this institution, and to the evidence of the benefits of Emancipation; and if so, then the weight of guilt on this nation is great and increasing. Our fathers carried on slavery in much blindness. They lived and walked under the shadow of a dark and bloody past. But the darkness is gone. The "mystery of iniquity" is now laid open. Slavery, from its birth to its last stage, is now brought to light. The wars, the sacked and burning villages, the kidnapping and murders of Africa, which begin this horrible history; the crowded hold, the chains, stench, suffocation, burning thirst, and agonies of the slave-ship; the loathsome diseases and enormous waste of life in the middle passage; the

wrongs and sufferings of the plantation, with its reign of terror and force, its unbridled lust, its violations of domestic rights and charities—these all are revealed. The crimes and woes of slavery come to us in moans and shrieks from the old world and the new, and from the ocean which divides them; and we are distinctly taught, that in no other calamity are such wrongs and miseries concentrated as in this. To put an end to some of these woes, the most powerful nations have endeavoured, by force of laws and punishments, to abolish the slave-trade; but the trial has proved, that, while slavery endures, the traffic which ministers to it cannot be suppressed. At length the axe has been laid at the root of the accursed tree. By the act of a great nation nearly a million of slaves have been Emancipated; and the first results have exceeded the hopes of philanthropy. All this history of slavery is given to the world. The truth is brought to our very doors. And, still more, to *us*, above all people, God has made known those eternal principles of freedom, justice, and humanity, by which the full enormity of slavery may be comprehended. To shut our eyes against all this light; to shut our ears and hearts against these monitions of God, these pleadings of humanity; to stand forth, in this great conflict of good with evil, as the chief upholders of oppression; to array ourselves against the efforts of the Christian and civilised world for the extinction of this greatest wrong; to perpetuate it with obstinate madness where it exists, and to make new regions of the earth groan under its woes—this, surely, is a guilt which the justice of God cannot wink at, and on which insulted humanity, religion, and freedom, call down fearful retribution.

NOTES

Note to page 81.

On this page I have spoken of the manner in which the slaves in the West Indies received Emancipation. This great event took place in Antigua on the first of August, 1834. The following account of the manner in which the preceding night was kept, is extracted from Thome and Kimball's book on the subject:—

"The Wesleyans kept 'watch-night' in all their chapels on the night of the 31st July. One of the Wesleyan missionaries gave us an account of the watch-meeting at the chapel in St. John's. The spacious house was filled with the candidates for liberty. All was animation and eagerness. A mighty chorus of voices swelled the song of expectation and joy, and as they united in prayer, the voice of the leader was drowned in the universal acclamation of thanksgiving, and praise, and blessing, and honour, and glory, to God, who had come down for their deliverance. In such exercises the evening was spent until the hour of twelve approached. The missionary then proposed that when the clock on the cathedral should begin to strike, the whole congregation should fall upon their knees and receive the boon of freedom in silence. Accordingly, as the loud bell tolled its first note, the immense assembly fell prostrate on their knees. All was silence, save the quivering half-stifled breath of the struggling spirit. The slow notes of the clock fell upon the multitude; peal on peal, peal on peal, rolled over the prostrate throng, in tones of angels' voices, thrilling among the desolate chords and weary heart-strings. Scarce had the clock sounded its last note, when the lightning flashed vividly around, and a loud peal of thunder roared along the sky—God's pillar of fire, and trump of jubilee! A moment of profoundest silence passed—then came the *burst*—they broke forth in prayer; they shouted, they sung, 'Glory,' 'Alleluia;' they clapped their hands, leaped up, fell down, clasped each other in their free arms, cried, laughed, and went to and fro, tossing

upward their unfettered hands; but high above the whole there was a mighty sound which ever and anon swelled up; it was the utterings in broken negro dialect, of gratitude to God.

"After this gush of excitement had spent itself, and the congregation became calm, the religious exercises were resumed, and the remainder of the night was occupied in singing and prayer, in reading the Bible, and in addresses from the missionaries, explaining the nature of the freedom just received, and exhorting the free people to be industrious, steady, obedient to the laws, and to show themselves in all things worthy of the high boon which God had conferred upon them."

Note to page 83.

On reading to a friend my remarks on the African character, he observed to me, that similar views had been taken by Alexander Kinmont, in his "Lectures on Man: Cincinnati, 1839." This induced me to examine the lectures, and I had the satisfaction of finding not only a coincidence of opinions, but that the author had pursued the subject much more thoroughly and illustrated it with much strength and beauty. I would recommend this work to such as delight in bold and original thinking. The reader, indeed, will often question the soundness of the author's conclusions; but even in these cases, the mind will be waked up to great and interesting subjects of reflection. I will subjoin a few extracts relating to the African character:—

"When the epoch of the civilization of the Negro family arrives, in the lapse of ages, they will display in their native land some very peculiar and interesting traits of character, of which we, a distinct branch of the human family, can at present form no conception. It will be—indeed it must be—a civilization of a peculiar stamp; perhaps, we might venture to conjecture, not so much distinguished by art as a certain beautiful nature, not so marked or adorned by science, as exalted and refined by a new and lovely theology;—a reflection of the light of heaven, more perfect and endearing than that which the intellects of the Caucasian race have ever yet exhibited. There is more of the *child*, of unsophisticated nature, in the Negro race than in the European."—p. 190.

"The peninsula of Africa is the home of the Negro and the appropriate and destined seat of his future glory and civilization,—a civilization which we need not fear to predict will be as distinct in all its features from that of all other races, as his complexion and natural temperament and genius are different. But who can doubt that here, also, humanity in its more advanced and millenial stage will reflect, under a sweet and mellow light, the softer attributes of the divine beneficence. If the Caucasian race is destined, as would appear from the precocity of their genius and their natural quickness and extreme aptitude to the arts, to reflect the lustre of the divine wisdom, or to speak more properly, the divine science, shall we envy the Negro, if a later but far nobler civilization await him,—to return the splendour of the divine attributes of mercy and benevolence in the practice and exhibition of all the milder and gentler virtues?"—p. 191.

"If there are fewer vivid manifestations of intellect in the Negro family than in the Caucasian, as I am disposed to believe, does that forbid the hope of the return of that pure and gentle state of society among them which attracts the peculiar regard of heaven?" —p. 192.

"The sweeter graces of the Christian religion appear almost too tropical and tender plants to grow in the soil of the Caucasian mind; they require a character of human nature, of which you can see the rude lineaments in the Ethiopian, to be implanted in and grow naturally and beautifully withal."—p. 218.

A

DISCOURSE

ON

THE LIFE AND CHARACTER

OF

THE REV. JOSEPH TUCKERMAN, D. D.

DELIVERED AT THE WARREN-STREET CHAPEL,

ON SUNDAY EVENING, JAN. 31, 1841.

DISCOURSE

ON

THE LIFE AND CHARACTER

OF THE

REV. JOSEPH TUCKERMAN, D.D.

Five years ago this Chapel was dedicated to the moral and religious instruction of the poor of this city. This event makes no noise in history, and may seem to some to merit no particular notice. It is remembered, however, by not a few individuals and families, as the beginning of many good influences. Still more, it is not an event which stands alone. This chapel is the sign of an important movement, which is not soon to pass away. It sprung from the labours of that faithful servant of God, to whom we owe the establishment of the Ministry at Large in this place. It is intimately connected with, and reveals to us, his life and labours; and accordingly the anniversary of its dedication to religious services, is a fit occasion for offering a tribute to his memory. I have wished, ever since his removal, to express my reverence for his character, and my sense of the greatness of his work. To these topics I invite your attention. But before entering on them, I

propose to consider a more general subject, which was often on the lips of our departed friend, to which he constantly recurred in his writings, and on the comprehension of which the permanence of the Ministry at Large chiefly depends. This subject is, the obligation of a city to care for and watch over the moral health of its members, and especially to watch over the moral safety and elevation of its poorer and more exposed classes. The life of our departed friend embodied and expressed this truth with singular power, and the consideration of it is a natural and fit introduction to a memorial of his virtues and labours, as well as particularly adapted to the occasion which has brought us together.

Why is it, my friends, that we are brought so near to one another in cities? It is, that nearness should awaken sympathy; that multiplying wants should knit us more closely together; that we should understand one another's perils and sufferings; that we should act perpetually on one another for good. Why were we not brought into being in solitudes, endowed each with the power of satisfying to the full his particular wants? God has room enough for a universe of separate, lonely, silent beings, of selfish, unshared enjoyment. But through the whole range of nature, we find nothing insulated, nothing standing alone. Union is the law of his creation. Even matter is an emblem of universal sympathy, for all its particles tend towards one another, and its great masses are bound into one system by mutual attraction. How much more was the human race made for sympathy and mutual aid. How plain is the social destination of man, born as he is into the arms

of love, sustained from the beginning by human kindness, endowed with speech, and plunged among fellow-beings, to whose feelings he cannot but respond, into whose hearts he yearns to pour his own, and whose rights, feelings, and interests, are commended to his regard by a law of love and justice, written within him by a divine hand. Can we ask why such beings are gathered into cities? Is it not, that they should propose a common weal? Is it not, that they should desire and seek each other's highest good?

What is the happiest community? What the city which should be chosen above all others as our home? It is that, the members of which form one body, in which no class seeks a monopoly of honour or good, in which no class is a prey to others, in which there is a general desire, that every human being may have opportunity to develope his powers. What is the happiest community? It is not that, in which the goods of life are accumulated in a few hands, in which property sinks a great gulf between different ranks, in which one portion of society swells with pride, and the other is broken in spirit; but a community, in which labour is respected, and the means of comfort and improvement are liberally diffused. It is not a community, in which intelligence is developed in a few, whilst the many are given up to ignorance, superstition, and a gross animal existence; but one, in which the mind is so reverenced in every condition, that the opportunities of its culture are afforded to all. It is a community, in which religion is not used to break the many into subjection, but is dispensed, even to the poorest, to rescue them from the degrading influence of poverty, to give them generous sentiments and hopes, to exalt them from animals

into men, into Christians, into children of God. This is a happy community, where human nature is held in honour, where, to rescue it from ignorance and crime, to give it an impulse towards knowledge, virtue, and happiness, is thought the chief end of the social union.

It is the unhappiness of most large cities, that, instead of this union and sympathy, they consist of different ranks, so widely separated as, indeed, to form different communities. In most large cities there may be said to be two nations, understanding as little of one another, having as little intercourse, as if they lived in different lands. In such a city as London, the distance of a few streets only will carry you from one stage of civilisation to another, from the excess of refinement to barbarism, from the abodes of cultivated intellect to brutal ignorance, from what is called fashion to the grossest manners; and these distinct communities know comparatively nothing of each other. There are travellers from that great city who come to visit our Indians, but who leave at home a community as essentially barbarous as that which they seek, who, perhaps, have spent all their lives in the midst of it, giving it no thought. To these travellers, a hovel, in one of the suburbs which they have left, would be as strange a place as the wigwam of our own forests. They know as little what thousands of their own city suffer, to what extremities thousands are reduced, by what arts thousands live, as they know of the modes of life in savage tribes. How much more useful lessons would they learn, and how much holier feelings would be awakened in them, were they to penetrate the dens of want, and wo, and crime, a few steps from their own door, than they gain from exploring this new world!

And what I say of London is true also of this city in a measure. Not a few grow up and die here, without understanding how multitudes live and die around them, without having descended into the damp cellar, where childhood and old age spend day and night, winter and summer, or without scaling the upper room, which contains within its narrow and naked walls not one, but two and even three families. They see the poor in the street, but never follow them in thought to their cheerless homes, or ask how the long day is filled up. They travel, in books at least, to distant regions, among nations of different languages and complexions, but are strangers to the condition and character of masses who speak their native tongue, live under their eye, and are joined with them for weal or wo in the same social state. This estrangement of men from men, of class from class, is one of the saddest features of a great city. It shows that the true bond of communities is as yet imperfectly known.

The happy community is that, in which its members care for one another, and in which there is especially an interest in the intellectual and moral improvement of all. That sympathy which provides for the outward wants of all, which sends supplies to the poor man's house, is a blessed fruit of Christianity; and it is happy when this prevails in and binds together a city. But we have now learned, that the poor are not to be essentially, permanently aided by the mere relief of bodily wants. We are learning, that the greatest efforts of a community, should be directed not to relieve indigence, but to dry up its sources, to supply moral wants, to spread purer principles and habits, to remove the temptations to intemperance and sloth, to snatch the child

from moral perdition, and to make the man equal to his own support, by awakening in him the spirit and the powers of a man. The glory and happiness of a community consists in vigorous efforts, springing from love, sustained by faith, for the diffusion through all classes of intelligence, of self-respect, of self-control, of thirst for knowledge, and for moral and religious growth. Here is the first end, the supreme interest which a community should propose, and in achieving it, all other interests are accomplished.

It is a plain truth, and yet how little understood, that the greatest thing in a city is Man himself. He is its end. We admire its palaces; but the mechanic who builds them is greater than palaces. Human nature in its lowest form, in the most abject child of want, is of more worth than all outward improvements. You talk of the prosperity of your city. I know but one true prosperity. Does the human soul grow and prosper here? Do not point me to your thronged streets. I ask, who throng them? Is it a low-minded, self-seeking, gold-worshipping, man-despising crowd, which I see rushing through them? Do I meet in them, under the female form, the gaily-decked prostitute, or the idle, wasteful, aimless, profitless woman of fashion? Do I meet the young man, showing off his pretty person as the perfection of nature's works, wasting his golden hours in dissipation and sloth, and bearing in his countenance and gaze the marks of a profligate? Do I meet a grasping multitude, seeking to thrive by concealments and frauds? An anxious multitude, driven by fear of want to doubtful means of gain? An unfeeling multitude, caring nothing for others, if they

may themselves prosper or enjoy? In the neighbourhood of your comfortable or splendid dwellings are there abodes of squalid misery, of reckless crime, of bestial intemperance, of half-famished childhood, of profaneness, of dissoluteness, of temptation for thoughtless youth? And are these multiplying with your prosperity, and outstripping and neutralising the influences of truth and virtue? Then your prosperity is a vain show. Its true use is to make a better people. The glory and happiness of a city consist not in the number, but the character of its population. Of all the fine arts in a city, the grandest is the art of forming noble specimens of humanity. The costliest productions of our manufactures are cheap, compared with a wise and good human being. A city, which should practically adopt the principle, that man is worth more than wealth or show, would gain an impulse that would place it at the head of cities. A city, in which men should be trained worthy of the name, would become the metropolis of the earth.

God has prospered us, and, as we believe, is again to prosper us in our business; and let us show our gratitude by inquiring for what end prosperity is given, and how it may best accomplish the end of the giver. Let us use it to give a higher character to our city, to send refining, purifying influences through every department of life. Let us especially use it, to multiply good influences in those classes which are most exposed to temptation. Let us use it to prevent the propagation of crime from parent to child. Let us use it in behalf of those, in whom our nature is most depressed, and who, if neglected, will probably bring on themselves the arm of penal law. Nothing is so just a

cause of self-respect in a city, as the healthy, moral condition of those who are most exposed to crime. This is the best proof, that the prosperous classes are wise, intelligent, and worthy of their prosperity. Crime is to the State what dangerous disease is to the human frame, and to expel it should be to the community an object of the deepest concern. This topic is so important, that I cannot leave it without urging it on your serious thoughts.

Society has hithorto employed its energy chiefly to punish crime. It is infinitely more important to prevent it; and this I say not for the sake of those alone on whom the criminal preys. I do not think only or chiefly of those who suffer from crime. I plead also, and plead more, for those who perpetrate it. In moments of clear, calm thought, I feel more for the wrongdoer than for him who is wronged. In a case of theft, incomparably the most wretched man is he who steals, not he who is robbed. The innocent are not *undone* by acts of violence or fraud from which they suffer. They are innocent, though injured. They do not bear the brand of infamous crime; and no language can express the import of this distinction. When I visit the cell of a convict, and see a human being who has sunk beneath his race, who is cast out by his race, whose name cannot be pronounced in his home or only pronounced to start a tear, who has forfeited the confidence of every friend, who has lost that spring of virtue and effort, the hope of esteem, whose conscience is burdened with irreparable guilt, who has hardened himself against the appeals of religion and love, here, here I see a Ruin. The man whom he has robbed or murdered, how much happier than he! What I want is, not merely that so-

ciety should protect itself against crime, but that it shall do all that it can to preserve its exposed members from crime, and so do for the sake of these as truly as for its own. It should not suffer human nature to fall so deeply, so terribly, if the ruin can be avoided. Society ought not to breed monsters in its bosom. If it will not use its prosperity to save the ignorant and poor from the blackest vice, if it will even quicken vice by its selfishness and luxury, its worship of wealth, its scorn of human nature, then it must suffer, and deserves to suffer, from crime.

I would that, as a city, we might understand and feel, how far we are chargeable with much of the crime and misery around us, of which we complain. Is it not an acknowledged moral truth, that we are answerable for all evil which we are able, but have failed, to prevent? Were Providence to put us in possession of a remedy for a man dying at our feet, and should we withhold it, would not the guilt of his death lie at our door?

Are we not accessory to the destruction of the blind man, who, in our sight, approaches a precipice, and whom we do not warn of his danger? On the same ground much of the guilt and misery around us, must be imputed to ourselves. Why is it, that so many children in a large city grow up in ignorance and vice? Because that city abandons them to ruinous influences, from which it might and ought to rescue them. Why is beggary so often transmitted from parent to child? Because the public, and because individuals do little or nothing to break the fatal inheritance. Whence come many of the darkest crimes? From despondency, recklessness, and a pressure of suffering, which sympathy would have lightened. Human sympathy, Chris-

tian sympathy, were it to penetrate the dwellings of the ignorant, poor, and suffering, were its voice lifted up to encourage, guide, and console, and its arm stretched out to sustain, what a new world would it call into being! What a new city should we live in! How many victims of stern justice would become the living, joyful witnesses of the regenerating power of a wise Christian love.

In these remarks I have expressed sympathy with the criminal; but do not imagine, that I have any desire to screen him from that wise punishment, which aims at once to reform offenders and protect society. The mercy, which would turn aside the righteous penalties of law, is, however unconsciously, a form of cruelty. As friends of the tempted part of the community, we should make the escape of the criminal next to hopeless. But let not society stop here. Let it use every means in its power of rescuing its members from the degradation and misery of crime and public punishment. Let it especially protect the exposed child. Here is a paramount duty, which no community has yet fulfilled. If the child be left to grow up in utter ignorance of duty, of its Maker, of its relation to society, to grow up in an atmosphere of profaneness and intemperance, and in the practice of falsehood and fraud, let not the community complain of his crime. It has quietly looked on and seen him, year after year, arming himself against its order and peace; and who is most to blame, when at last he deals the guilty blow? A moral care over the tempted and ignorant portion of the State, is a primary duty of society.

I know that objection will be made to this representation of duty. It will be said, by not a few, "We

have not time to take care of others. We do our part in taking care of ourselves and our families. Let every man watch over his own household, and society will be at peace." I reply first, this defence is not founded in truth. Very few can honestly say, that they have no time or strength to spend beyond their families. How much time, thought, wealth, strength, is wasted, absolutely wasted, by a large proportion of every people. Were the will equal to the power, were there a fraternal concern for the falling and fallen members of the community, what an amount of energy would be spent in redeeming society from its terrible evils, without the slightest diminution of exertion at home.

But, still more, we defeat ourselves, when we neglect the moral state of the city where we live, under pretence of caring for our families. How little may it profit you, my friends, that you labour at home, if in the next street, amidst haunts of vice, the incendiary, the thief, the ruffian, is learning his lesson, or preparing his instruments of destruction? How little may it profit you, that you are striving to educate your children, if around you, the children of others are neglected, are contaminated with evil principles or impure passions? Where is it that our sons often receive the most powerful impulses? In the street, at school, from associates. Their ruin may be sealed by a young female brought up in the haunts of vice. Their first oaths may be echoes of profaneness which they hear from the sons of the abandoned. What is the great obstruction to our efforts for educating our children? It is the corruption around us. That corruption steals into our homes, and neutralises the influence of home. We hope to keep our little circle pure, amidst general

impurity. This is like striving to keep our particular houses healthy, when infection is raging around us. If an accumulation of filth in our neighbourhood, were sending forth foul stench and pestilential vapours on every side, we should not plead as a reason for letting it remain, that we were striving to prevent a like accumulation within our own doors. Disease would not less certainly invade us, because the source of it was not prepared by ourselves. The infection of moral evil is as perilous as that of the plague. We have a personal interest in the prevalence of order and good principles on every side. If any member of the social body suffer, all must suffer with it. This is God's ordination, and his merciful ordination. It is thus, that he summons us to watch over our brother for his good. In this city, where the children are taught chiefly in public schools, all parents have peculiar reason for seeking that all classes of society be improved.

Let me add one more reply to the excuse for neglecting others, drawn from the necessity of attending to our own families. True, we must attend to our families; but what is the great end which we should propose in regard to our children? Is it, to train them up for themselves only? to shut them up in their own pleasures? to give them a knowledge, by which they may serve their private interests? Should it not be our first care, to breathe into them the spirit of Christians? to give them a generous interest in our race? to fit them to live and to die for their fellow-beings? Is not this the true education? And can we then educate them better, than by giving them, in our own persons, examples of a true concern for our less prosperous fellow-creatures? Should not our common tones

awaken in them sympathy with the poor, and ignorant, and depraved? Should not the influences of home fit them to go forth as the benefactors of their race? This is a Christian education. This is worth all accomplishments. Give to society a generous, disinterested son or daughter, and you will pay with interest the debt you owe it. Blessed is that home, where such members are formed, to be heads of future families and fountains of pure influence to the communities of which they form a part. In this respect our education is most deficient. Whilst we pay profusely for superficial accomplishments, very little is done to breathe a noble, heroic, self-sacrificing spirit into the young.

In reply to these remarks, ill-boding scepticism will cry out, "Why all this labour? Society cannot be improved. Its evils cannot be done away." But this croaking has little significance to one who believes in Christ, the divinely ordained Regenerator of the world, and who compares, in the light of history, the present with past times. On these authorities, I maintain that society *can* be improved. I am confident that this city would become a new place, a new creation, were the intelligent and good to seek in earnest to spread their intelligence and goodness. We have powers enough here for a mighty change, were they faithfully used. I would add, that God permits evils for this very end, that they should be resisted and subdued. He intends that this world shall grow better and happier, not through his own immediate agency, but through the labours and sufferings of benevolence. This world is left, in a measure, to the power of evil, that it should become a monument, a trophy to the power of goodness. The greatness of its crimes and woes is not a

ground for despair, but a call to greater effort. On our earth the Divine Philanthropist has begun a war with evil. His cross is erected to gather together soldiers for the conflict, and victory is written in his blood. The spirit which Jesus Christ breathes, has already proved itself equal to this warfare. How much has it already done to repress ferocity in Christian nations, to purify domestic life, to abolish or mitigate slavery, to provide asylums for disease and want? These are but its first fruits. In the progress already made by communities under its influences, we are taught that society is not destined to repeat itself perpetually, to stand still forever. We learn that great cities need not continue to be sinks of pollution. No man has seized the grand peculiarity of the present age, who does not see in it the means and material of a vast and beneficent social change. The revolution which we are called to advance, has in truth begun. The great distinction of our times, is a diffusion of intelligence and refinement and of the spirit of progress through a vastly wider sphere than formerly. The middle and labouring classes have means of improvement not dreamed of in earlier times; and why stop here? Why not increase these means where now enjoyed? Why not extend them, where they are not possessed? Why shall any portion of the community be deprived of light, of sympathy, of the aids by which they may rise to comfort and virtue?

At the present moment, it is singularly unreasonable to doubt and despair of the improvement of society. Providence is placing before our eyes, in broad light, the success of efforts for the melioration of human affairs. I might refer to the change produced among

ourselves within a few years, by the exertions of good men for the suppression of intemperance, the very vice which seemed the most inveterate, and which, more than all others, spreads poverty and crime. But this moral revolution in our own country sinks into nothing, when compared with the amazing and almost incredible work now in progress on the other side of the ocean. A few years ago, had we been called to name the country of all others most degraded, beggared, and hopelessly crushed by intemperance, we should have selected Ireland. There men and women, old and young, were alike swept away by what seemed the irresistible torrent. Childhood was baptised into drunkenness. And now, in the short space of two or three years, this vice of ages has almost been rooted out. In a moral point of view, the Ireland of the past is vanished. A new Ireland has started into life. Three millions of her population have taken the pledge of total abstinence, and instances of violating the pledge are very, very rare. The great national anniversaries, on which the whole labouring population used to be dissolved in excess, are now given to innocent pleasures. The excise on ardent spirits has now been diminished nearly half a million sterling. History records no revolution like this. It is the grand event of the present day. Father Mathew, the leader in this moral revolution, ranks far above the heroes and statesmen of the times. As Protestants, we smile at the old legends of the Catholic Church; but here is something greater, and it is true. However we may question the claims of her departed saints, she has a living minister, if he may be judged from one work, who deserves to be canonized, and whose name should be placed in the calendar not far below

Apostles. And is this an age, in which to be sceptical as to radical changes in society, as to the recovery of the mass of men from brutal ignorance and still more brutal vice?

The remarks which have now been made are needed at the present moment. Our city is growing, and we are impatient for its more rapid growth, as if size and numbers were happiness. We are anxious to swell our population. Is it not worth our while to inquire, what kind of a population we are to gather here? Are we so blind as to be willing and anxious to repeat the experience of other cities? Are we willing to increase only our physical comforts, our material wealth? Do we not know, that great cities have hitherto drawn together the abandoned? have bred a horde of ignorant, profligate, criminal poor? have been deformed by the horrible contrasts of luxury and famine, of splendour and abject wo? Do we not know, that, among the indigent and laborious classes of great cities, the mortality is fearfully great in comparison with that of the country, a result to be traced to the pestilential atmosphere which these people breathe, to the filth, darkness and dampness of their dwellings, to the suffering, comfortless condition of their children, and to the gross vices which spring up from ignorance and destitution? Do we want no better destiny for this our dear and honoured metropolis? You will not suspect me of being a foe to what are called improvements. Let our city grow. Let railroads connect it with the distant West. Let commerce link it with the remotest East. But whilst its wealth and numbers grow, let its means of intelligence, religion, virtue, domestic purity and fraternal union grow faster. Let us be more anxious

for moral than physical growth. May God withhold prosperity, unless it is to be inspired, hallowed, ennobled by public spirit, by institutions for higher education, and by increasing concern of the enlightened and opulent for the ignorant and poor. If prosperity is to narrow and harden us, to divide us into castes of high and low, to corrupt the rich by extravagance and pride, and to create a more reckless class of poor, then God avert it from us. But prosperity need not be so abused. It admits of noble uses. It may multiply the means of good. It may multiply teachers of truth and virtue. It may make the desert places of society blossom as the rose. To this end may our prosperity be consecrated. Thus may we requite the Author of all good.

How we may accomplish the good work now set before us, I have not time to say. I would only ask your attention to one means of improving our city, to which our attention is particularly called by the occasion which has brought us together. I refer to the Ministry at Large. The reasons of this institution are too obvious to require laboured exposition. That those classes of society, which enjoy fewest advantages of education, peculiarly need instruction and the voice of the living teacher; that those whose habits, conditions, and wants exclude them, in effect, from our churches, should be visited in their homes by the ministers of Christianity, who does not see and acknowledge? If we, with every means of culture, need the Christian ministry, the poor need it more. Is it not a duty, and should we not rejoice, to send forth faithful, enlightened men, whose office shall be, to strengthen those whom corrupt influences are sweeping from duty with peculiar power, to guide those who have no other counsellor, to

admonish and cheer those who are pressed with heaviest temptations, to awaken the minds of those who are almost unconscious of their intellectual powers, to breathe fortitude into those who suffer most, to open a better world to those to whom this world is darkened, and above all to snatch their children from ruin, to protect the young who seem born to a heritage of want or crime? The ministry devoted to these offices, is undeniably a wise, Christian, noble institution. This evening you are called to contribute to its support. Do so cheerfully. You are not called to uphold a plan of doubtful charity, or to send teachers to remote regions, where years of anxious labour must be spent on an unbroken, unthankful soil, before the fruit can appear. You are invited to sustain an institution, seated in the heart of our city, and which, as you know, is sending the waters of life through our own population. Its chapels, Sunday schools, libraries, are in the midst of you. The doors to which its ministers carry counsel and consolation, are near your own. You see its influences this moment in these children. Its aim is to remove the saddest features of our civilisation, the deep corruption of great cities; and in the energy which it now puts forth, we have a pledge of a happier era, in which society will prosper without the terrible sacrifice of so many of its members. May this good work go on and spread, and may future generations bless us for saving them from some of the worst evils which darken our own age.

I have now closed my remarks on the general topic suggested by this occasion. But the work of the Ministry for the poor, has brought to my mind solemn and tender thoughts, which I know you will not think

foreign to our present meeting, and which it will be a relief to my own spirit to express. The Ministry at Large in this city was chiefly originated and established by one of my earliest, dearest friends, who closed his eyes not many months since on a foreign shore. Allow me to pay a tribute to his memory; and in doing this, allow me to speak with the freedom of friendship. I have not laboured to collect materials for a regular history of this distinguished man, for I believe that I shall be more just to his memory in giving reminiscences of our long intercourse, than in reporting a series of events. I will utter with all simplicity what rises to my memory, and I hope that the clear image which I bear of my departed friend may be transferred to the hearts of my hearers.

My acquaintance with JOSEPH TUCKERMAN began about forty-seven years ago, and, during most of the time which has since elapsed, we lived together as brothers, communicating thoughts, feelings, reproofs, encouragements, with a faithfulness not often surpassed. I think of him with peculiar pleasure, as he was, perhaps, the most signal example, within my remembrance, of Improvement; of a man overcoming obstacles, and making progress under disadvantages. When I first met him in college, he had the innocence of childhood; he was sympathising, generous, without a stain of the vices to which youth is prone; but he did not seem to have any serious views of life. Three years he passed almost as a holiday, unconscious of his privileges, uninterested in his severer studies, surrendering himself to sportive impulses, which, however harmless in themselves, consumed the hours which should have been given to toil. How often has he spoken to me, with

grief and compunction, of his early wasted life! In his last college year, a change began, and the remote cause of it he often spoke of with lively sensibility. His mother, he was accustomed to say, was one of the best of women. She had instilled into him the truths of religion with a mother's love, tempered with no common wisdom. The seed was sown in a kindly nature. The religious principle, which at first had only been a restraint from evil, began to incite to good; and to this, the progress and greatness of his life were mainly due. On leaving college, he gave himself to the Christian ministry; but with the unchastened inconsideration of his youth, he plunged into its duties with little preparation. The consequence was a succession of mortifications most painful at the time, but of which he afterwards spoke as a merciful discipline. So unpromising was the opening of a career of singular energy and usefulness.

By the kind ordination of Providence he was settled in a small, obscure parish, which offered nothing to gratify ambition or to dissipate the mind. Years passed in a life which we should call monotonous, but which was singularly fitted to give him the calmness and steadiness which he needed. Here he became a student, a faithful, laborious student, and accumulated much knowledge, and devoted no little time to the thorny topics of theology. Thus the defects of his early intellectual training were repaired, and his faculties sharpened and invigorated.

He was not, however, made to wear out life in such pursuits. His strength did not lie in abstract speculation. Had he given himself to this, he would never have forced his way to new or great views. His heart

was his great power. To his moral, religious, benevolent sentiments, he owed chiefly the expansion of his intellectual nature. Having laid a good foundation by study, an unerring instinct taught him that study was not his vocation. His heart yearned for active life. He became more and more penetrated with the miseries and crimes of the world. As he sat in his lonely study, the thought of what men endured on the land and the sea withdrew him from his books. He was irresistibly attracted towards his fellow-creatures by their sufferings, and, still more, by a consciousness that there was something great beneath their sufferings, by a sympathy with their spiritual wants. His study-window looked on the sea; and the white sail, as it skirted the horizon, reminded him of the ignorance and moral perils of the sailor; and accordingly he was the first man in the country to make an effort for the improvement and instruction of this class of men. The society which he instituted for this end did not answer its purpose, for he knew little or nothing of the people he wished to serve, nor was the community then awake, as it now is, to the work of reform. But the spirit which was moving in him, was not depressed by failure. He soon gave himself with zeal to the missionary cause; thought, talked, and wrote about it with characteristic energy; and, had not family ties prevented, would have devoted himself, I believe, to the service of the heathen.

Whilst the passion for conflict with evil was struggling within him, his health failed, and for a time he had reason to fear that he was to be cut off from usefulness. But the same gracious Providence which had ordained, with signal kindness, the events of his past existence, was guiding him through this dark passage to the great

sphere and purpose of his life. His disease incapacitated him for answering the demand made upon his voice by the pulpit. He felt that he must cease from regular preaching; and what, then, was he to do? In a favoured hour, the thought of devoting himself to the service of the poor of this city entered his mind, and met a response within which gave it the character of a divine monition. He consulted me, and in obedience to a long-rooted conviction, that society needs new ministries and agencies for its redemption, and that men, inspired with self-sacrificing zeal for its redemption, are God's best gifts to the world, I encouraged his faith and hope.

At first, he entered almost tremblingly the houses of the poor, where he was a stranger, to offer his sympathy and friendship. But "the sheep knew the voice of the shepherd." The poor recognised by instinct their friend, and from the first moment a relation of singular tenderness and confidence was established between them. That part of his life I well remember, for he came often to pour into my ear and heart his experience and success. I well remember the effect which contact with the poor produced on his mind. He had loved them when he knew little of them; when their distresses came to him through the imagination. But he was a proof, that no speculation or imagination can do the work of actual knowledge. So deep was the sympathy, so intense the interest which the poor excited in him, that it seemed as if a new fountain of love had been opened within him. No favourite of fortune could have repaired to a palace, where the rays of royal favour were to be centred on him, with a more eager spirit and quicker step, than our friend hastened

to the abodes of want in the darkest alleys of our city. How often have I stood humbled before the deep, spiritual love, which burst from him in those free communications which few enjoyed beside myself. I cannot forget one evening, when, in conversing with the late Dr. Follen and myself on the claims of the poor, and on the cold-heartedness of society, he not only deeply moved us, but filled us with amazement by his depth of feeling and energy of utterance; nor can I forget, how, when he left us, Dr. Follen, a man fitted by his own spirit to judge of greatness, said to me, *He is* a great man.

This strong love for his fellow-creatures was not a wild enthusiasm. It was founded on clear, deliberate perception of the spiritual nature, the immortal destination of every human being. Whoever discerns truly, and feels deeply, this greatness of humanity, this relation of the soul to God, must indeed pass for an enthusiast in the present day; for our state of society is, in a great degree, a denial of the higher rights, claims, and destinies of a human being.

It was this love for the poor which gave to our friend's labours their efficacy, which made his ministry a living thing, and which gave it perpetuity. This house and our other chapels had their foundation in this love. He could not be kept from the poor. Cold, storms, sickness, severe pain, could not shut him up at home. Nothing but his domestic ties prevented him from taking up his abode among the indigent. He would sometimes say, that could he, on leaving the world, choose his sphere, it would be that of a ministering spirit to the poor; and if the spirits of departed good men return to our world, his, I doubt not, might be found in

the haunts of want and wo. In this, as I have already said, there was no blinding enthusiasm. He saw distinctly the vices which are often found among the poor, their craft, and sloth, and ingratitude. His ministry was carried on in the midst of their frequent filth and recklessness. The coarsest realities pressed him on every side. These were not the scenes to make an enthusiast. But amidst these he saw, now the fainter signs, now the triumphs of a divine virtue. It was his delight to relate examples of patience, disinterestedness, piety, amidst severest sufferings. These taught him, that, in the poorest hovels, he was walking among immortals, and his faith in the divinity within the soul turned his ministry into joy.

Dr. Tuckerman has sometimes been called the founder of the Ministry at Large. If by this language be meant, that he first planned and established a distinct ministry for the poor, the language is incorrect. Before his time, there had been men who had devoted themselves exclusively and faithfully to the religious instruction of those who cannot be gathered into the ordinary places of worship. His merit lay in giving a new life to the work, in showing what it could do, in raising it from neglect to a high place among the means of regenerating the world, and in awakening new hopes of the improvement of what had been looked on as the hopeless portion of society. The greatest benefactors of men, are not so much those who discover or contrive wholly original and untried modes of action, as those who seize on familiar means or agencies and exalt them into new powers. Our friend had hardly entered into his ministry, when he discovered its capacities. He saw that it opened a sphere of usefulness

which had hardly been dreamed of. With prophetic faith, he threw into it his whole soul; and his example and success raised up others to confide in and to wield the same power. He may thus be said, in an important sense, to have established this ministry. Through him it has taken root in men's faith. It has passed, with all the energy which he imparted to it, into other hands, and is seen and felt to deserve a place among our permanent institutions. Much of this success was undoubtedly due to his singleness of heart; but much also to his clear insight into the principles of human nature, which rendered the poor open to good influences, and into the means by which human beings in their condition may be most effectually approached.

In carrying on this great work, Dr. Tuckerman did not stand alone. He received important aids from sympathising friends. He began his labours under the patronage of the American Unitarian Association. At length, to ensure the continuance of the Ministry at Large, and to extend its operation, a union, or, as it is called, a fraternity of several churches in the city was formed, to take this important work under its guidance and care. There were some among us, who had come to feel that a Christian church was established not only for the edification of its own members, but for the general cause of Christianity; and that it was especially bound to extend the means of moral and religious instruction to such families or individuals in its neighbourhood, as from poverty or any other causes were deprived of the benefit of the public ordinances of religion. In conformity to this idea, the Fraternity was formed, on a simple but efficient plan. In each of the churches disposed to co-operate for the support of the

Ministry at Large, a branch association is established, the members of which contribute to this work according to their means or sense of duty, and which is represented in a central board, to whose discretion the management of the whole concern is entrusted. By this arrangement various good ends are accomplished. The ministry of the poor has become linked with our most important religious institution, and may be hoped to partake of the durableness of the regular ministry. The churches are knit together by a new bond, not one of creeds or tribunals, or organizations to accumulate power, but the holy bond of charity; and still more, they are brought to recognise distinctly and practically their obligation to look beyond themselves, and to labour for the extension of Christian truth and virtue.

This association gave but a small salary to Dr. Tuckerman, but he desired nothing beyond what was necessary to save him from debt; and this he did desire. On this point he was peculiarly sensitive, so much so, that a notice of him would be imperfect in which this trait should be omitted. He shrunk from the slightest pecuniary embarrassment as an intolerable evil. "Owe no man anything," was a precept which he kept in sight in all his domestic arrangements; and by his strict economy and wise providence, he was able to spend a long life and bring up a large family, without once anticipating his income, or without contracting a debt. Some of his friends of looser habits received lessons of wisdom and reproof in this respect from his counsel and example.

As to the great ideas which ruled over and guided his ministry, and as to the details of his operations, they may be gathered best from the reports which he

was accustomed to make to the societies under whose patronage he acted. He published indeed a volume on this subject; but it is hardly worthy of his abilities or his cause. It was prepared under the pressure of disease, when his constitution was so exhausted by excessive labour that he was compelled to forego all out-door duties. He wrote it with a morbid impatience, as if he might be taken away before giving it to the world. It ought in truth to be regarded as an extemporaneous effusion. It was hurried through the press, whilst the friends whom he had consulted, were hoping that it was undergoing a patient revision. Thus hastily composed, it was necessarily diffuse; a fault which marks his most careful writings. It might indeed have been compressed to half the size; and, as might be expected, it fell almost dead from the press. This sore trial he bore with great equanimity; but he felt it deeply. The saddest words I heard from him in his sickness, were those in which he expressed his regrets at having precipitated this publication.

It is in his reports chiefly that the history of his ministry is to be studied. These are a treasure for the man who would act wisely on the poor. They are records of an uncommonly various experience. They show his insight into the temptations, perils, hearts of the depressed and indigent; and whilst exposing their errors and sins, breathe a never-failing sympathy. It is easy to see in these, that the great principle which animated his ministry, was an immoveable faith in God's merciful purposes towards the poor. Their condition never for a moment seemed to him to separate them from their Creator. On the contrary, he felt God's presence in the narrow comfortless dwelling of the poor, as he felt it nowhere else.

His perpetual recognition of the spiritual, immortal nature of the poor, gave to all his intercourse a character of tenderness and respect. He spoke to them plainly, boldly, but still as to the children of the same infinite Father. He trusted in man's moral nature, however bruised and crushed; he was sure that no heart could resist him, if he could but convince it of his sincere brotherly concern. One rule he observed almost too instinctively, to make it a rule. He always spoke encouragingly. He felt that the weight under which the poor man's spirit was already sinking, needed no addition from the harshness of his spiritual guide. He went forth in the power of brotherly love, and found it a divine armour. On this point too much cannot be said. The city of Boston has the honour, above all cities, of proving how much can be accomplished by a generous, affectionate mode of speech and action, among those classes of society, which it has been thought can only be reached by menace, sternness, and terror. Dr. Tuckerman and his successors in their intercourse with the poor, and the Rev. Mr. Taylor in his labours among seamen, have taught us, that men, in the most unpromising conditions, are to be treated as men; that under coarse jackets and even rags, may be found tender and noble hearts; and that the heart, even when hardened, still responds to the voice of a true friend and brother. The horrible thought, that certain portions of society are to be kept down by appeals to their superstition and fear, has here received a refutation very cheering to the friends of humanity. Dr. Tuckerman carried among the poor his own highest views of religion, and often spoke to me of the eagerness with which they were received. He was indeed too wise a man to give them in an abstract form, or in tech-

nical language. They were steeped in his heart before they found their way to his lips; and flowing warm and fresh from this fountain, they were drunk in as living waters, by the thirsty souls of the poor.

A great secret of Dr. Tuckerman's success, lay in his strong interest in individuals. It was not in his nature to act on masses by general methods; he threw his soul into particular cases. Every sufferer whom he visited, seemed to awaken in him a special affection and concern. I remember well the language which he once used in regard to a man who had gone far astray. He said to me with deep emotion, "I want that man's soul; I *must* save him." He made the worst feel that they had a friend, and by his personal interest linked them anew with their race.

Let me add another explication of his success. He sought for something to love in all. He seized on anything good, which might remain in the fallen spirit; on any domestic affection, any generous feeling, which might have escaped the wreck of the character. If he could but touch one chord of love, one tender recollection of home, one feeling of shame or sorrow for the past, no matter how faintly, he rejoiced and took courage, like the good physician, who, in watching over the drowned, detects a flutter of the pulse or the feeblest sign of life. His hope in such cases tended to fulfil itself. His tones awakened a like hope in the fallen. "He did not break the bruised reed or quench the smoking flax."

He began his ministry expecting to accomplish his work by visiting and conversation, and this he always relied on as the most important means of usefulness. But he soon found, that social worship could not be dis-

pensed with; that this was a want of human nature; that the poor, by the mere circumstance of leaving their homes and coming together in decent apparel for the worship of God, received a salutary impulse; and that, in this way, they could be brought most effectually to act on one another for good. He therefore resumed preaching, though unequal to the effort. The effect of this new situation in awakening his powers as a preacher was striking. In his sermons written for common congregations, he had never been very attractive; but his free, extemporaneous, fervent address, drew round him a crowd of poor who hung on his lips; and those who were not poor were moved by his fervent utterance. His idea of preaching underwent a great change. Whilst abstaining from public complaint, he would in private mourn over the lifeless discussions of the pulpit, which too often make the church cold as the grave.

His influence over the poor was a good deal increased by the variety of forms in which he exerted it. He was not merely a spiritual guide. He had much skill in the details of common life, was a good economist, understood much about the trades and labours in which the poor are most occupied, could suggest expedients for diminishing expense and multiplying comforts, and by these homely gifts won the confidence of the poor. He could sympathise with them in their minutest wants and sufferings, and opened a way for his high truths by being a wise counsellor as to their worldly interests. At the very moment when he passed with some for an enthusiast, he was teaching household management to a poor woman, or contriving employment for her husband, or finding a place for her child.

This reminds me of one branch of his labours in which

he took special interest. He felt deeply for the children of the poor. They were in his mind habitually as he walked the streets, and when he entered the indigent dwelling. He used to stop to inquire into the residence and history of the begging child. He visited the market and the wharf, to discover the young, who were wasting the day in sloth, taking their first lessons in the art of theft. He was unwearied in his efforts to place these children in schools; and multitudes owe to him their moral safety and the education which prepared them for respectable lives. Through his means, not a few who had escaped all domestic control, and entered on the downward path of crime, were sent to the house of reformation; and he delighted to meet or speak of those who under this influence had been restored to innocence. To the interest which he awakened in the unprotected children of the poor, we owe chiefly the establishment of the Farm School. If any subject peculiarly occupied his thoughts and heart, it was the duty of the city to that portion of the young, who, if not adopted by society, must grow up to guilt and shame and public punishment. If his benevolence ever broke out in bitter reproach, it was in speaking of the general insensibility to the neglected child, trained up by its parents to beggary and fraud, accustomed to breathe the fumes of intemperance, and left to look on vice as its natural state. Such was his influence, that street-beggary sensibly declined among us, an effect indicating an extent of good influence, not easily apprehended.

To show his generous modes of viewing the poor, I would state, that for a time he assembled the children one afternoon in the week, to give them instruction in natural history. He took great delight in this branch

of knowledge, and had stored up in his mind a large number of facts, illustrative of the wisdom and goodness of God in the creation. These he used to unfold, and was able to awaken the curiosity and fix the attention of his young hearers; of which indeed they furnished proof, by giving him a portion of time usually spent in play. His want of strength, which compelled him to relinquish the pulpit, obliged him to give up this mode of teaching after a short trial.

I mention these various exertions, as illustrative of the enlarged spirit which he carried into his work. His great object was to promote religion; but religion did not stand alone in his mind. He felt its connection with intellectual cultivation, with wise household management, with neatness and propriety of manners, and especially with the discharge of parental duty; and his labours may be said to have covered almost all the departments of social life. The truth is, that his heart was in his work. He did not think of it as the work of a day, or of a few years, but of life. He wanted to grow old and die in it. The world opened nothing to him in all its various callings, more honourable, more godlike. His ambition, of which he had his share, and his disinterested and religious principles, all flowed into this channel; so that he acted with undivided energy, with a whole soul. Hence he became fruitful in expedients, detected new modes of influence, wound his way to his end gently and indirectly, and contrived to turn almost everything to account. Some indeed complained, that he dragged his poor into all companies and conversation. But we must learn to bear the infirmities of a fervent spirit, and to forgive a love which is stronger than our own, though it may happen to want the social tact, in which the indifferent and trifling are apt to make the most proficiency.

On one subject Dr. Tuckerman agreed in opinion and feeling with all who visit and labour for the poor. He felt that the poverty of our city was due chiefly to Intemperance, and that this enhances infinitely the woes of a destitute condition. A poor family, into which this vice had not found its way, was a privileged place in his sight. Poverty without drunkenness hardly seemed to rank as an evil, by the side of that which drunkenness had generated. If there was one of our citizens whom he honoured as eminently the friend of the poor, it was that unwearied philanthropist, who, whilst his heart and hands are open to all the claims of misery, has selected as his peculiar care, the cause of temperance.* Dr. Tuckerman's spirit groaned under the evils of intemperance, as the ancient prophets under the burden of the woes which they were sent to denounce. The fumes of a distillery were, to his keen feelings, more noisome and deadly than the vapours of putrefaction and pestilence. He looked on a shop for vending ardent spirits, as he would have looked on a pitfall opening into hell. At the sight of men, who, under all our present lights, are growing rich by spreading these poisons through the land, he felt, I doubt not, how the curses of the lost and the groans of ruined wives and children were rising up against them. I know, for I have heard, the vehemence of entreaty with which Dr. Tuckerman sometimes approached the intemperate; and he has often related to me his persevering efforts for their recovery. Could he have bequeathed to the sober and Christian part of this city and Commonwealth, his intense convictions in regard to this vice, it would soon be repressed; the sanction of public authority would

* Moses Grant.

no longer be given to its detestable haunts; one chief source of the miseries of our civilization would be dried up.

The influence of Dr. Tuckerman's labours, was not confined to this city or country. His reports found their way to Europe, and awakened similar exertions. When his declining health obliged him to cross the ocean not many years since, he met in England a cordial welcome from kindred spirits. His society was coveted by the good and eminent, and his experience listened to with profound respect. It was his happiness to meet there Rammohun Roy. I was informed by a friend, who was present at their interviews, that this wise and great Hindoo, whose oriental courtesy overflowed towards all, still distinguished our countryman by the affectionate veneration with which he embraced him. In France he was received with much kindness by the Baron Degerando, the distinguished philosopher and philanthropist, whose extensive and profound researches into poverty, and into the means of its prevention or cure, have left him no rival, whether in the present or past times. This virtuous man, whose single name is enough to redeem France from the reproach, sometimes thrown on her, of indifference to the cause of humanity, has testified in private letters and in his writings, his high consideration for the character and labours of our departed friend. In truth, Dr. Tuckerman's influence is now felt on both sides the ocean, and his name, linked as it is with the ministry of the poor, is one of the few among us which will be transmitted to remote posterity. There is hardly a more enduring monument on which a man can inscribe his name, than a beneficent institution founded on the

principles of human nature, and which is to act on large portions of society. Schemes of policy, accumulations of power, and almost all the writings of an age, pass away. The men who make most noise, are lost and forgotten like the blasts of a trumpet. But Institutions wrought into a people's habits and especially incorporated with Christianity, that immortal truth, that everlasting kingdom, endure for ages. Our friend has left a name to live; not that a name is worth an anxious thought; but the ambitious, who mistake for it the shout of a brief day, may be usefully reminded, that it is the meed of those who are toiling in obscure paths, and on whom they hardly deign to bestow a passing thought. Dr. Tuckerman was not wholly raised above this motive; and who of us is? But his work was incomparably dearer to him than renown; he toiled for years without dreaming of the reputation it was to bestow; and in that season of small things he used to say, that if the rich and great who helped to sustain him, could understand the dignity and happiness of his calling, they would covet it themselves, and choose to partake the toil which they deputed to another.

There was one testimony to his usefulness which gave him pleasure, and that was the sympathy of Christians who differed from him in opinion. He went among the poor to serve the purposes of no sect, but to breathe into them the spirit and hopes of Jesus Christ; and in all sects he found hearty well-wishers, and perhaps he left on none of us deeper impression of his piety, than on those with whose peculiarities he had least communion.

Among the propitious circumstances of the life of Dr. Tuckerman, I ought not to pass over his domestic

ties. He was twice married, and each of these connexions gave him an invaluable friend. I was particularly acquainted with his last wife, with whom a large part of his life was spent, and am happy to pay this tribute to her singular worth. Her reserve and shrinking delicacy threw a veil over her beautiful character. She was little known beyond her home; but there she silently spread around her that soft, pure light, the preciousness of which is never fully understood till it is quenched. The good Providence which adapts blessings to our wants, was particularly manifested in giving to our friend such a companion. Her calm, gentle wisdom, her sweet humility, her sympathy, which, though tender, was too serene to disturb her clear perceptions, fitted her to act instinctively, and without the consciousness of either party, on his more sanguine, ardent mind. She was truly a spirit of good, diffusing a tranquillising influence too mildly to be thought of, and therefore more sure. The blow which took her from him, left a wound which time could not heal. Had his strength been continued, so that he could have gone from the house of mourning to the haunts of poverty, he would have escaped, for a good part of the day, the sense of his bereavement. But a few minutes' walk in the street now sent him wearied home. There, the loving eye which had so long brightened at his entrance, was to shed its mild beam on him no more. There the voice that had daily inquired into his labours, and like another conscience had whispered a sweet approval, was still. There the sympathy which had pressed with tender hand his aching head, and by its nursing care had postponed the hour of exhaustion and disease, was gone. He was not indeed left alone; for filial love and

reverence spared no soothing offices; but these, though felt and spoken of as most precious, could not take the place of what had been removed. This great loss produced no burst of grief. It was a still, deep sorrow, the feeling of a mighty void, the last burden which the spirit can cast off. His attachment to life, from this moment, sensibly declined. In seasons of peculiar sensibility he wished to be gone. He kept near him the likeness of his departed friend, and spoke to me more than once of the solace which he had found in it, as what I, in my more favoured lot, could not comprehend. He heard her voice from another world, and his anticipations of that world, always strong, became now more vivid and touching.

Enough has been said to illustrate the singular social virtues of Dr. Tuckerman. It is however true, that in his casual intercourse with strangers, he did not make as favourable an impression as might have been expected from such a man. He seemed to those who saw him seldom, too self-conscious. His excitable temperament sometimes hurried him into extravagance of speech. His feelings sometimes prevailed over his judgment. He wanted skill to detect the point, beyond which the sympathy of the hearer could not follow him, so that he sometimes seemed to exact undue attention. The truth is, that human nature, even in very good men, is disproportioned, imperfect. We sometimes express our wonder at the meeting of elements so incongruous in the same character. But is there one of us so advanced, as not to know from inward experience, the contradictions of the human soul? It is cheering to think, how little our trust in superior goodness is impaired by these partial obscurations. No man perhaps

saw more distinctly than myself the imperfections of the good man of whom I speak. But my confidence in his great virtues, was as firm as if he had been faultless. There was a genuineness in his love, his disinterestedness, of which I had no more doubt than of his existence. If ever man gave himself sincerely to the service of his race, it was he.—I have made these remarks, because I have long questioned the morality and wisdom of the prevalent style of indiscriminate praise of the dead. I fear we give a suspiciousness to our delineations of our friends, by throwing over them the hues of unreal perfection. I hold no man to be worthy of eulogy, who cannot afford to be spoken of as he was, who, after the worst is known, cannot inspire reverence and love.

I have spoken of Dr. Tuckerman in relation to his fellow-creatures, I should wrong him greatly if I did not speak of him in his highest relations. In these, the beauty of his character was most apparent to those who saw farthest into his heart. Others admired his philanthropy; to me his piety was more impressive. It partook of the warmth of his nature, but was calmer, wiser, purer, than his other emotions. It was simple, free, omnipresent, coming out in unaffected utterance, colouring his common thoughts and feelings, and giving strength and elevation to all his virtues. It was such a piety as might be expected from its early history, a piety breathed from the lips and caught from the beaming countenance of an excellent mother.

His religion was of the most enlarged, liberal character. He did not shut himself up even in Christianity. He took a lively interest in the testimony borne to God by nature, and in the strivings of ancient philosophy after divine truth. But Christianity was his rock, his

defence, his nutriment, his life. He understood the character of Jesus by sympathy, as well as felt the need of his "glad tidings." He had been a faithful student of the Old Testament, and had once thought of preparing a work on Jewish antiquities. But his growing reverence for the New Testament, led him to place a vast distance between it and the ancient scriptures. At one period of his ministry, when the pressing demands of the poor compelled him to forego study entirely, I recollect his holding up to me a Greek Harmony of the Four Gospels, and his saying, that here was his library, that Christ's history was his theology, and that in the morning he snatched a moment for this, when he could find time for nothing else.

Religion in different individuals, manifests itself in different forms. In him it shone forth peculiarly in faith or filial trust, and in gratitude. His faith in God was unbounded. It never wavered, never seemed to undergo a momentary eclipse. I have seen him under an affliction, which, in a few days, wrought in his appearance the change of years; and his trust was like a rock, his submission entire. Much as he saw of the crimes and miseries of life, no doubt of the merciful purposes of God crossed his mind. Some ray of divine goodness streamed forth from the darkest trials and events. Undoubtedly his own love for the poor, helped him to comprehend, as few do, how God loved them. The whole creation spoke to him of the paternal character and infinite glory of its author. His filial piety called forth in him powers which would otherwise have slumbered. He was naturally wanting in the poetical element. He had little relish for music or the fine arts, and took no great pleasure in the higher

works of imagination. But his piety opened his eye, ear, heart, to the manifestations of God in his works, revealed the beauty which surrounded him, and in this way became a source of sublime joy. On such a mind, religious controversies could take but a slight hold. He outgrew them, and hardly seemed to know that they existed. That which pervades, tranquillises, and exalts the souls of all Christians, he understood; and in his busy life, which carried him from his study, he was willing to understand nothing more.

Congenial with this cheerful faith was the spirit of gratitude. In this he was probably the more eminent, because it was favoured by his temperament. He was naturally happy. There were next to no seeds of gloom, depression in his nature. Life, as he first knew it, was bright, joyous, unclouded; and to this cause mainly, the volatility of his early years was to be ascribed. As the magnet searches out, and gathers round itself the scattered ore with which it has affinity, so his spirit selected and attached instinctively to itself the more cheerful views of Providence. In such a nature, piety naturally took the form of gratitude. Thanks were the common breathings of his spirit. His lot seemed to him among the most favoured on earth. His blessings did not wait to be recalled to his thoughts by a set, laboured search. They started up of themselves, and stood before him robed in celestial light by association with the goodness which bestowed them.

From these elements of his piety, naturally grew up a hope of future glory, progress, happiness, more unmixed than I have known in others. The other world is commonly said to throw a brightness over the present. In his case, the present also threw a brightness

over the future. His constant experience of God's goodness, awakened anticipations of a larger goodness hereafter. He would talk with a swelling heart, and in the most genuine language, of immortality, of Heaven, of new access to God. In truth, his language was such as many good men could not always join in. The conscious unworthiness of many good men, throws occasional clouds over the future. But no cloud seemed ever to dim his prospect; not that he was unconscious of unworthiness; not that he thought of approaching Infinite Purity with a claim of merit; such a feeling never crossed his mind. But it was so natural to him to enjoy, his sense of God's constant goodness was so vivid, and Christ's promises so accordant with his experience, that heaven came to him as a reality, without the ordinary effort which the faith and hope of most men require.

In his last sickness, his character came out in all its beauty. He had not wholly lost the natural love of life. At times, when unpromising symptoms seemed to be giving way, he would use the means of recovery with hope. But generally he felt himself a dying man, whose chief work was finished, who had little to do with the world, but to leave it. I have regretted that I did not take notes of some of his conversations. It was unsafe for him to talk, as the least excitement increased his burning fever; but when I would start an interesting topic, a flood of thoughts would rush into his mind, and compel him to give them utterance. The future state was, of course, often present to him; and his conceptions of the soul's life and progress, in its new and nearer relations to God, to Christ, to the just made perfect, seemed to transport him for a time beyond the

darkness and pains of his present lot. To show that there was no morbidness in these views, I ought to observe, that they were mingled with the natural tastes and feelings, which had grown from his past life. In his short seasons of respite from exhaustion and suffering, he would talk with interest of the more important events of the day, and would seek recreation in books which had formerly entertained him. He was the same man as in health, with nothing forced or unnatural in his elevation of mind. He had always taken great pleasure in the writings of the moralists of antiquity, and perhaps the last book I put into his hands was Cicero's Tusculan Questions, which he read with avidity and delight. So comprehensive was his spirit, that whilst Christ was his hope, and Christian perfection his aspiration, he still rejoiced to discern in the great Roman, on whom Christian truth had not yet dawned, such deep reverence for the majesty of virtue. It might be expected that "his ruling passion was strong in death." To the last moment of my intercourse with him, the poor were in his heart. As he had given them his life, so death could not divide him from them.

One affecting view remains to be given. Dr. Tuckerman was a martyr to his cause. That his life was shortened by excessive toil cannot be doubted. His friends forewarned him of this result. He saw the danger himself, and once and again resolved to diminish his labours; but when he retreated from the poor, they followed him to his house, and he could not resist their supplicating looks and tones. To my earnest and frequent remonstrance on this point he at times replied, that his ministry might need a victim, that labours beyond his strength might be required to show what it

was capable of effecting, and that he was willing to suffer and to die for the cause. Living thus, he grew prematurely old. His walks became more and more narrow. Then he was imprisoned at home. The prostration of strength was followed by a racking cough and burning fever. As we have seen, his last sickness was a bright testimony to his piety. But its end was sorrowful. By a mysterious ordination of Providence, the capacity of suffering often survives unimpaired, whilst the reason and affections seem to decay. So was it here. In the last hours of our friend, the body seemed to prevail over the power of thought. He died in fearful pain. He was borne amidst agonies into the higher world. At length his martyrdom ceased; and who of us can utter or conceive the blessedness of the spirit, rising from this thick darkness into the light of Heaven?

Such was the founder of the Ministry at Large in this city, a man whom I thoroughly knew; a man whose imperfections I could not but know, for they stood out on the surface of his character; but who had a great heart, who was willingly a victim to the cause which, in the love and fear of God, he had espoused, and who has left behind him as a memorial, not this fleeting tribute of friendship, but an institution which is to live for ages, and which entitles him to be ranked among the benefactors of this city and the world. When he began his work, he had no anticipation of such an influence and such an honour. He thought that he was devoting himself to an obscure life. He did not expect that his name would be heard beyond the dwellings of the poor. He was contented with believing that here and there an individual or a family would re-

ceive strength, light, and consolation from his ministry. But gradually the idea that he was beginning a movement that might survive him, and might more and more repress the worst social evils, opened on his mind. He saw more and more clearly, that the Ministry at Large, with other agencies, was to change the aspect of a large portion of society. It became his deliberate conviction, and one which he often repeated, that great cities need not be haunts of vice and poverty; that in this city, there were now intelligence, virtue, and piety enough, could they be brought into united action, to give a new intellectual and moral life to the more neglected classes of society. In this faith he acted, toiled, suffered, and died. His gratitude to God for sending him into this field of labour never failed him. For weeks before he left the country, never to return, I was almost the only visitor whom he had strength to see; and it was a joy to look on his pale, emaciated face, lighted up with thankfulness for the work which had been given him to do, and with the hope that it would endure and grow when he should sleep in the dust. From such a life and such a death, let us learn to love our poor and suffering brethren; and, as we have ability, let us send to them faithful and living men, whose sympathy, counsels, prayers, will assuage sorrow, awaken the conscience, touch the heart, guide the young, comfort the old, and shed over the dark paths of this life the brightness of the life to come.

APPENDIX.

In the preceding Discourse, I have not spoken very distinctly of one part of Dr. Tuckerman's character, the strength of his attachment to individuals. He was not absorbed in one great object. The private and public affections lived together in him harmoniously and with equal fervour. His experience of life had not the common effect of chilling his early enthusiasm or his susceptibility of ardent attachment. He was true to old friends and prepared for new ones. His strong interest and delight in Dr. Follen and Dr. Spurzheim, showed how naturally his heart opened itself to noble-minded strangers. From the latter, his mind received a leaning towards phrenology. When he went to England, his sympathies created a home for him wherever he stayed. Where other men would have made acquaintance, he formed friendships. One of these was so precious to him, and contributed so much to the happiness of both parties, that it deserves notice in a memoir of him. I refer to his friendship with Lady Byron. Of his college class-mates, there were others as well as myself who enjoyed much of his affection to the last. One of these, was Jonathan Phillips, Esq., whom he accompanied to Europe, and who had a true reverence for his goodness. The other, was Judge Story, so eminent as a Jurist at home and abroad. While the preceding Discourse was passing through the press, I wrote to the latter, requesting him to communicate to me his reminiscences of our friend; and with characteristic kindness and warmth of heart, he sent me the following letter, written, as he says, in haste, but which will give much pleasure to all who have an interest in the deceased. I publish it the more gladly, because his views of our friend's life at college, are more favourable than those which I have given.

TO THE REV. W. E. CHANNING, D. D.

CAMBRIDGE, April 10, 1841.

MY DEAR SIR,

I comply very cheerfully with your request, although there are very few reminiscences of our late lamented class-mate and friend, the Rev. Dr. Tuckerman, which I could supply, which are not already familiar to your mind. During our collegiate life, my acquaintance with him was but slight, until my junior year, when he became my chum; and so pleasant and confidential was our intercourse during that year, that we should undoubtedly have continued chums during the remainder of our college studies, if some family arrangements had not made it convenient for him to adopt a different course. The change, however, did not prove the slightest interruption of our intercourse and friendship; and I feel great gratification in saying, that, from that period until the close of his life, I am not conscious that there was on either side any abatement of mutual affection and respect; and whenever and wherever we met, it was with the warm welcome of early and unsuspected friendship.

Many of the characteristics so fully developed in his later life, were clearly manifested when our acquaintance first commenced. During his college life he did not seem to have any high relish for most of the course of studies then pursued. He had an utter indifference, if not dislike, to mathematics, and logic, and metaphysics; and but a slight inclination for natural philosophy. He read the prescribed classical writers with moderate diligence, not so much as a matter of taste or ambition, as of duty, and as a task belonging to the recitation-room, the Latin being uniformly preferred to the Greek. And yet I should not say, that he was idle or indolent, or without a strong desire of improvement. His principal pleasure lay in a devotion to the more open and facile branches of literature, and especially of English literature. History, moral philosophy, poetry, the drama, and the class of studies generally known by the name of belles-lettres, principally attracted his attention; and in these his reading was at once select and various. The writings of Addison, Johnson, and Goldsmith, were quite familiar to him. The historical works of Robertson, and Gillies, and Ferguson, and other authors distinguished in that day, as well

as the best biographical works, were within the range of his studies. In poetry he was more attached to those who addressed the feelings and imagination, than to those who addressed the understanding, and moralised their song in the severe language of the condensed expression of truth, or the pungent pointedness of satire, or the sharp sallies of wit. Gray's Bard, and Collins's Ode to the Passions, were his favourites; and above all, Shakspere, in whose writings he was thoroughly well read, and often declaimed many of the most stirring passages with the spirit and interest of the dramatic action of the stage. Young's Night Thoughts seemed to be almost the only work, which, from its deep and touching appeals, and elevated devotion, and darkened descriptions of life, and sudden bursts of eloquence and enthusiasm, made him feel at that time the potency of genius employed in unfolding religious truths. He possessed, also, a singular readiness and facility in composition, perhaps what would by some persons be deemed a dangerous facility. What he wrote, he threw off at once in appropriate language, rarely correcting his first sketch, and not ambitious of condensing or refining the materials by successive efforts.

I have thus far spoken of his taste and intellectual pursuits, and attachments in our college life. But what I most delight to dwell on, are his warm-hearted benevolence, his buoyant and cheerful temper, his active, sympathetic charity, his gentle and frank manners, and above all, that sunniness of soul, which cast a bright light over all hours, and made our fireside one of the most pleasant of all social scenes. So uniform, indeed, was his kindness and desire to oblige, that I do not remember a single instance in which he ever betrayed either a hastiness of temper or a flash of resentment. He was accustomed to distribute a portion of his weekly allowance among the poor, and the friendless, and the suffering. His love of morals and virtue was as ardent as it was elevated. His conduct was blameless and pure. I do not believe that he ever wrote a word which, dying, he could have wished to blot on account of impurity of thought or allusion; and his conversation was, at all times, that which might have been heard by the most delicate and modest ears. Occasionally his buoyancy of spirits might lead him to indulge in giddy dreaminess, or romantic fervours, such as belong to the untried hopes and inexperience of

youth. But it might with truth be said, that, even if he had any failings in this respect, they leaned to virtue's side.

I confess, however, that the opening of his literary career did not then impress me with the notion that he would afterwards attain in his profession and character, the eminence to which every one will now deem him justly entitled. He seemed to want that steadiness of purpose, which looks difficulties in the face and overcomes obstacles, because a high object lies behind them. His mind touched and examined many subjects, but was desultory and varying in its efforts. I was in this view mistaken; and I overlooked the probable effects upon a mind like his, of deep religious sensibility, and, if I may so say, of an enthusiasm for goodness, when combined with a spirit of glowing benevolence.

When we quitted college, our opportunities of familiar intercourse, from the wide diversity of our pursuits, as well as from our local distance, were necessarily diminished. I saw him only at distant intervals, while he was engaged in his preparatory studies for the ministry; and when, on entering his study one day, I found him reading Griesbach's edition of the New Testament with intense attention, and in his comments on it in our conversation, discoursing with a force and discrimination, which showed the earnestness with which he was endeavouring to master his profession, a new light struck upon me, and I began to perceive that he was redeeming his time, and disciplining his thoughts to the highest purposes. During his residence, after his settlement at Chelsea, I saw him frequently, either at Salem, where I then resided, or at Chelsea, where I took occasion on my visits to Boston, to pass some time at his house. His improvement was constantly visible; his studies more expanded; his knowledge more exact as well as various; and his piety, that beautiful ornament so deeply set in his character, shining forth with its deep, and mild, and benignant light, with a peculiar attractiveness. I remember, that for a long time "Tucker's Light of Nature" was one of his favourite studies; and he made it the theme both of his praise and his criticism at many of our meetings. It was while he was at Chelsea, the minister of a comparatively small and isolated parish, that he nourished and matured the great scheme of his life and ambition, the Ministry at Large for the Poor. I need not dwell upon its beneficial effects, or its extraordinary success. I deem it one of the

most glorious triumphs of Christian charity over the cold and reluctant doubts of popular opinion. The task was full of difficulties, to elevate the poor into a self-consciousness of their duty and destiny, and to bring the rich into sympathy with them; to relieve want and suffering without encouraging indolence or sloth; to give religious instruction, where it was most needed, freely and without stint, and thus to widen the sphere, as well as the motives to virtue, among the desolate and the desponding. It was, in fact, doing what Burke has so beautifully expressed. It was to remember the forgotten.

But I am wandering from my purpose, and speaking to one who fully understands, and has eagerly supported this excellent institution—and yet I think you will agree with me in saying, that its establishment and practical success was mainly owing to the uncompromising zeal and untiring benevolence of Dr. Tuckerman. It was the crowning labour of his life, and entitles him to a prominent rank among the benefactors of mankind.

I do not know any one, who exemplified in his life and conduct a more fervent or unaffected piety, than Dr. Tuckerman did. It was cheerful, confiding, fixed, and uniform. It was less an intellectual exercise than a homage of the heart. It sprung from a profound feeling of the mercy and goodness of God. It was reverential; but at the same time filial. His death was in perfect keeping with his life; it was a good man's end with a good man's Christian resignation, hope, and confidence.

It was in the summer which preceded his death, that, on his recovery from a severe illness, he rode out to Cambridge. He came to my house, and in his warm, yet anxious manner, said to me, "I could not pass your house, my friend, without desiring to see you once more before I died. I have been very ill, and as I thought, very near to death. But I was tranquil and resigned, and ready to depart, if it was God's good pleasure. And I felt no fears." He stayed with me some time, as long as I would allow him in his then feeble state of health. He talked over our long friendship, our youthful doings, our advancing years. And when we parted, he bade me a most affectionate farewell. It was our final farewell—I saw his face no more.

I send you, my dear sir, these hasty sketches, such as they are, with a flying pen. I cannot suppose, that there is anything in

them which would not have occurred more forcibly to others who knew Dr. Tuckerman. But I was unwilling to withhold my tribute to the great excellencies of his character, his zeal in all good works, and his diffusive benevolence.

"Hiis saltem accumulem donis, et fungar inani Munere."

Believe me, truly and affectionately,

Your Class-mate and Friend,

JOSEPH STORY.

A friend has kindly translated the following from the Introduction to Baron de Gerando's late work on Public Charity:—

In a work recently published in Boston, by the respectable Dr. Tuckerman, we have a very remarkable exemplification of this assiduous, enlightened charity, quickened by religious sentiment. Dr. Tuckerman holds the offices of Minister at Large, and distributor of charity to the indigent people of the city of Boston, and renders to a society of which he is the delegate, a yearly account of his ministrations and observations. A work that he has just published contains the substance of a series of periodical reports, which throw invaluable light upon the condition and wants of the indigent, and the influence which an enlightened charity can exert. As we read, we follow the steps of the minister of the gospel, carrying assistance and consolation into the bosom of families, overwhelmed with misfortune; and raising the debased, reforming the depraved. In such a school we learn the secrets of the art of benevolence. The author finds occasion, in treating this subject, to rise to the highest views of the theory and rules of this art. He makes his readers feel all the power of Christianity for the moral improvement of the lower classes; he compares the legislation in his own country, in respect to the poor, with that of England and Scotland; discusses the rights of the indigent; and compares the relative situations of the rich and the poor, in order to the discovery of their mutual duties. He particularly discriminates between poverty and pauperism, and points out the grievous effects of the error which confounds them.

The following Biographical Sketch of Dr. Tuckerman, is taken from an article upon his life and character, by Rev. E. S. Gannet, in the Monthly Miscellany of Religion and Letters, July 1840.

JOSEPH TUCKERMAN was born in Boston, January 18, 1778. Of the early instructions of his mother, a truly pious woman, he always spoke with peculiar gratitude. His youth was passed in preparation for college, partly at Phillips Academy in Andover, and partly in the family of Rev. Mr. Thacher, of Dedham. In 1794, he entered Harvard College, where he was graduated, in 1798, as one of the class to which Judge Story and Rev. Dr. Channing also belonged. His preparatory studies for the ministry were pursued under the direction of Rev. Mr. Thacher, of Dedham. Soon after he began to preach, he received an invitation to become the successor of Rev. Dr. Payson at Chelsea, where he was ordained November 4, 1801. In June 1803, he was married to a daughter of the late Samuel Parkman, Esq. of this city, who died in the summer of 1807. In November 1808, he was again married to Miss Sarah Carey, of Chelsea, who, after thirty-one years of the most happy connexion, was taken to a higher life, leaving a remembrance dear to the hearts of a large circle of friends. In 1816 Mr. Tuckerman visited England in the hope of deriving benefit to his health, but was absent only a short time; after his return, he suffered much from dyspepsy, and never recovered the full tone of health. He continued in the active discharge of the duties of his ministry till the spring of 1826, when he felt the necessity of relinquishing, in some measure, the labours of the pulpit, and his mind, which had become much interested in the condition of the neglected poor of our cities, sought an opportunity of conducting a ministry peculiarly suited to their wants. On the 4th of November 1826, just twenty-five years from the day of his ordination, he preached his farewell sermon at Chelsea, and immediately commenced his service in Boston, to which place he soon removed with his family. He was at first assisted in this work by a private association of gentlemen, who had for some time held stated meetings for their own religious improvement and for conference upon the means of benevolent action; but he was very soon appointed a Minister at Large in this city by the Executive Committee of the American Unitarian Association, who became responsible for

the small salary which he received, and which for several years was raised by the contributions of ladies in our different congregations. In 1828 the Friend-Street Chapel was erected for his use, as a place of worship for those whom he had brought to a sense of the value of religious institutions, but who were unable to pay for the privileges of the sanctuary. His untiring zeal in this ministry, the success of his labours among the poor, and the extent of his influence over the rich, evinced particularly in the confidence which they reposed in him as the almoner of their charities, were subjects of too familiar remark to need any illustration. The ardour with which he prosecuted his labours was too much for his bodily strength, and in 1833 he again visited Europe in company with his friend, Mr. Phillips, and passed a year abroad, principally in England, where he formed many valuable friendships, and was instrumental in awakening much interest in his favourite subject —the moral elevation of the neglected and vicious poor. On his return he found the Ministry at Large placed on a more stable foundation than he had left it, the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches having been organised with a special view to its support. A more commodious chapel was erected, and younger labourers were associated with him. His own ability to render active service was, however, irretrievably impaired. The winter of 1836-7 he was obliged to spend in the milder climate of St. Croix, from which he returned, as it was thought, much benefited. But the vital force was too nearly exhausted. Repeatedly prostrated by disease, he rose only to show the steadfastness of those principles and purposes which filled his soul, and sunk again, as if to prove the constancy of the faith which seemed to gain new power from suffering and bereavement. From a severe illness in the autumn of 1839 he so far revived, that after much hesitation a voyage to Cuba was recommended as the only means of prolonging his life. He sailed for Havana, and soon sought the interior of the island; but a short trial proved the hopelessness of the attempt to recruit an exhausted frame, and he returned, with the daughter who was his devoted companion, to Havana, where after some days of extreme debility, attended with great suffering, he died, April 20, 1840, in his sixty-third year.

Dr. Tuckerman received the honorary degree of Doctor in Divinity from Harvard University in 1826. It was a tribute to his

ministerial fidelity. His published writings are few, excepting those which arose from his connexion with the Ministry at Large. One of the last services he rendered to this institution was the preparation of a volume, which we fear has not obtained a wide circulation, upon "The Principles and Results of the Ministry at Large."

At a meeting of the Central Board of the Benevolent Fraternity of Churches, May 10, 1840, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

"Resolved, That the death of Rev. Joseph Tuckerman, D.D. demands on the part of this Board an expression of their deep sense of the value of his services to this community, and that recognising in him the first incumbent, if not the founder,* of the present institution of the Ministry at Large, they cannot but acknowledge the usefulness of a life, the last years of which were devoted to this institution, in whose service his strength was exhausted; and while they submit to the Divine will, that has deprived them of the counsels and labours of this Christian philanthropist, they would cherish his spirit and hold up his example before themselves and others, as a motive and a guide to future exertions in behalf of the neglected and the sinful."

A resolution similar in character was passed at the annual meeting of the American Unitarian Association, May 26, 1840, *viz.*

"Resolved, That the death of Rev. Dr. Tuckerman, senior Min-

* In strictness of speech it might be doubted if Dr. Tuckerman should be styled the *founder* of the Ministry at Large, as gratuitous instruction to the poor had been given both by laymen and clergymen before his removal to Boston. In 1822 the Association to which we have adverted, had established evening religious lectures for those who attended no place of worship during the day; and Rev. Dr. Jenks was employed by another Society in visiting and preaching to the poor. When Dr. Tuckerman came to Boston, his own mind had not clearly defined its plans of operation, and the idea which was subsequently expanded into the institution of the Ministry at Large, had not perhaps proceeded beyond a general purpose of devoting himself to the spiritual benefit of those who had no religious teacher or friend. The Committee of the American Unitarian Association must also share in the honour of establishing this ministry. But as it was his perseverance and success that gave both form and efficiency to the institution, it is but a small deviation from accuracy to call him its founder.

ister at Large in this city, an institution once under the care of this Association, demands the expression of our sincere respect for his memory, our deep gratitude for his services; and while we regret that his life of eminent usefulness and distinguished Christian philanthropy is closed, we would bow with submission to the Divine will, and gather from his example lessons to quicken and guide our own efforts in the cause of human happiness and virtue."

Dr. Tuckerman's remains were brought to this country, and the funeral service was attended in King's Chapel, where he had been accustomed to worship during the last years of his life, in the afternoon of May 26. They were afterwards deposited at Mount Auburn.

THE PRESENT AGE;

AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED BEFORE

THE MERCANTILE LIBRARY COMPANY OF PHILADELPHIA,

MAY 11, 1841.

THE PRESENT AGE.

AN ADDRESS, &c.

GENTLEMEN OF THE MERCANTILE LIBRARY COMPANY,

I beg you to consider my appearance in this place, as an expression of my interest in this and in kindred Institutions. I welcome them as signs of the times, as promises and means of increased intellectual activity. I shall be glad, if a good word or a friendly effort on my part can serve them. I know, that the lectures delivered before such societies are called superficial; but this does not discourage me. All human productions, even those of genius, are very superficial, compared with the unfathomable depths of truth. The simple question is, Do these lectures rouse the mind to new action? Do they give it new objects of thought, and excite a thirst for knowledge? I am sure that they do; and therefore, though the field is sometimes called humble, I enter it with pleasure. Will you allow me to observe, that to render lectures useful, one condition is necessary; they must be frank, honest, free. He who speaks, must speak what he thinks; speak courteously, but uncompromisingly. What makes our communications unprofitable in this country, is the dread of giving offence, now to the majority, and now

to the fashionable or refined. We speak without force, because not true to our convictions. A lecturer will, of course, desire to wound no man's prejudices or feelings; but his first duty is to truth; his chief power lies in simple, natural, strong utterance of what he believes; and he should put confidence in his hearers, that the tone of manly sincerity will be responded to by candour and good will.

The subject to which I call your attention, is the Present Age; a vast theme, demanding volumes. An age is needed to expound an age; and, of course, little is to be expected in a brief hour. I profess no great understanding of the subject, though I have given it much thought. In truth, it cannot be grasped, as yet, by the highest intellect. This age is the result, issue, of all former ages. All are pouring themselves into it. The struggles, passions, discoveries, revolutions of all former time, survive in their influences on the present moment. To interpret the present thoroughly, we must understand and unfold all the past. This work I shall not undertake. I am not now to be a historian. Do not fear that I shall compel you to journey backward to the deluge or to paradise. I shall look only at the present; nor do I think of unfolding all the present. I shall seize on a single characteristic of our age, if not the profoundest, yet the most prominent and best fitted to an address like the present. In performing this task, my aim will be to speak the simple truth. I wish to say what the age is, not to be its advocate; and yet I hope to lead you to look tenderly and trustfully on it, to love it, and to resolve, with generous, stout hearts, that you will serve it, as far as God may give you ability.

In looking at our age, I am struck immediately with one commanding characteristic, and that is, the tendency in all its movements to expansion, to diffusion, to Universality. To this, I ask your attention. This tendency is directly opposed to the spirit of exclusiveness, restriction, narrowness, monopoly, which has prevailed in past ages. Human action is now freer, more unconfined. All goods, advantages, helps, are more open to all. The privileged, petted individual is becoming less, and the human race are becoming more. The multitude is rising from the dust. Once we heard of the few, now of the many; once of the prerogatives of a part; now of the rights of all. We are looking as never before, through the disguises, envelopments of ranks and classes, to the common nature which lies below them, and are beginning to learn, that every being who partakes of it, has noble powers to cultivate, solemn duties to perform, inalienable rights to assert, a vast destiny to accomplish. The grand idea of humanity, of the importance of man as man, is spreading silently, but surely. Not that the worth of the human being is at all understood as it should be; but the truth is glimmering through the darkness. A faint consciousness of it has seized on the public mind. Even the most abject portions of society are visited by some dreams of a better condition, for which they were designed. The grand doctrine, that every human being should have the means of self-culture, of progress in knowledge and virtue, of health, comfort, and happiness, of exercising the powers and affections of a man, this is slowly taking its place, as the highest social truth. That the world was made for all, and not for a few; that society is to care for all; that no human being shall

perish but through his own fault; that the great end of government is to spread a shield over the rights of all, these propositions are growing into axioms, and the spirit of them is coming forth in all the departments of life.

If we look at the various movements of our age, we shall see in them this tendency to universality and diffusion. Look first at Science and Literature. Where is Science now? Locked up in a few colleges or royal societies or inaccessible volumes? Are its experiments mysteries for a few privileged eyes? Are its portals guarded by a dark phraseology, which, to the multitude, is a foreign tongue? No; Science has now left her retreats, her shades, her selected company of votaries, and, with familiar tone, begun the work of instructing the race. Through the press, discoveries and theories, once the monopoly of philosophers, have become the property of the multitude. Its professors, heard not long ago in the university or some narrow school, now speak in the Mechanic Institute. The doctrine, that the labourer should understand the principles of his art, should be able to explain the laws and processes which he turns to account; that instead of working as a machine, he should join intelligence to his toil, is no longer listened to as a dream. Science, once the greatest of distinctions, is becoming popular. A lady gives us conversations on chemistry, revealing to the minds of our youth, vast laws of the universe, which, fifty years ago, had not dawned on the greatest minds. The school-books of our children contain grand views of the creation. There are parts of our country, in which Lyceums spring up in almost every village, for the purpose of mutual aid in the study of natural science. The



characteristic of our age, then, is not the improvement of science, rapid as this is, so much as its extension to all men.

The same characteristic will appear, if we inquire into the use now made of science. Is it simply a matter of speculation? a topic of discourse? an employment of the intellect? In this case, the multitude, with all their means of instruction, would find in it only a hurried gratification. But one of the distinctions of our time is, that science has passed from speculation into life. Indeed, it is not pursued enough for its intellectual and contemplative uses. It is sought as a mighty power, by which nature is not only to be opened to thought, but to be subjected to our needs. It is conferring on us that dominion over earth, sea, and air, which was prophesied in the first command given to man by his Maker; and this dominion is now employed, not to exalt a few, but to multiply the comforts and ornaments of life for the multitude of men. Science has become an inexhaustible mechanician; and by her forges, and mills, and steam-cars, and printers' presses, is bestowing on millions, not only comforts, but luxuries which were once the distinction of a few.

Another illustration of the tendency of science to expansion and universality, may be found in its aims and objects. Science has burst all bounds and is aiming to comprehend the universe, and thus it multiplies fields of inquiry for all orders of minds. There is no province of nature which it does not invade. Not content with exploring the darkest periods of human history, it goes behind the birth of the human race, and studies the stupendous changes which our globe experienced for hundreds of centuries, to become prepared for man's

abode. Not content with researches into visible nature, it is putting forth all its energies to detect the laws of invisible and imponderable matter. Difficulties only provoke it to new efforts. It would lay open the secrets of the polar ocean and of untrodden barbarous lands. Above all, it investigates the laws of social progress, of arts and institutions, of government and political economy, proposing as its great end the alleviation of all human burthens, the weal of all the members of the human race. In truth, nothing is more characteristic of our age, than the vast range of inquiry which is opening more and more to the multitude of men. Thought frees the old bounds to which men used to confine themselves. It holds nothing too sacred for investigation. It calls the past to account; and treats hoary opinions as if they were of yesterday's growth. No reverence drives it back. No great name terrifies it. The foundations of what seems most settled must be explored. Undoubtedly this is a perilous tendency. Men forget the limits of their powers. They question the infinite, the unsearchable, with an audacious self-reliance. They shock pious and revering minds, and rush into an extravagance of doubt, more unphilosophical and foolish than the weakest credulity. Still, in this dangerous wildness, we see what I am stating, the tendency to expansion in the movements of thought.

I have hitherto spoken of science, and what is true of science is still more true of literature. Books are now placed within reach of all. Works, once too costly except for the opulent, are now to be found on the labourer's shelf. Genius sends its light into cottages. The great names of literature are become household words among the crowd. Every party, religious or political, scatters its

sheets on all the winds. We may lament, and too justly, the small comparative benefit as yet accomplished by this agency; but this ought not to surprise or discourage us. In our present stage of improvement, books of little worth, deficient in taste and judgment, and ministering to men's prejudice and passions, will almost certainly be circulated too freely. Men are never very wise and select in the exercise of a new power. Mistake, error, is the discipline through which we advance. It is an undoubted fact, that silently books of a higher order are taking place of the worthless. Happily the instability of the human mind, works sometimes for good, as well as evil. Men grow tired at length even of amusements. Works of fiction cease to interest them; and they turn from novels to books, which having their origin in deep principles of our nature, retain their hold of the human mind for ages. At any rate, we see in the present diffusion of literature, the tendency to universality of which I have spoken.

The same tendency will appear, if we consider the kind of literature which is obtaining the widest favour. The works of genius of our age breathe a spirit of universal sympathy. The great poet of our times, Wordsworth, one of the few who are to live, has gone to common life, to the feelings of our universal nature, to the obscure and neglected portions of society, for beautiful and touching themes. Nor ought it to be said, that he has shed over these the charms of his genius; as if in themselves they had nothing grand or lovely. Genius is not a creator, in the sense of fancying or feigning what does not exist. Its distinction is, to discern more of truth than common minds. It sees, under disguises and humble forms, everlasting beauty. This it is the

prerogative of Wordsworth to discern and reveal in the ordinary walks of life, in the common human heart. He has revealed the loveliness of the primitive feelings, of the universal affections of the human soul. The grand truth which pervades his poetry is, that the beautiful is not confined to the rare, the new, the distant, to scenery and modes of life open only to the few; but that it is poured forth profusely on the common earth and sky, that it gleams from the loneliest flower, that it lights up the humblest sphere, that the sweetest affections lodge in lowly hearts, that there is sacredness, dignity, and loveliness, in lives which few eyes rest on, that even in the absence of all intellectual culture, the domestic relations can quietly nourish that disinterestedness which is the element of all greatness, and without which intellectual power is a splendid deformity. Wordsworth is the poet of humanity; he teaches reverence for our universal nature; he breaks down the factitious barriers between human hearts.

The same is true, in an inferior degree, of Scott, whose tastes however were more aristocratic. Scott had a childish love of rank, titles, show, pageants, and in general looked with keener eye on the outward life than into the soul. Still he had a human heart, and sympathised with his race. With few exceptions, he was just to all his human brethren. A reconciling spirit breathes through his writings. He seizes on the interesting and beautiful features in all conditions of life; gives us bursts of tender and noble feelings even from ruder natures; and continually knits some new tie between the reader and the vast varieties of human nature which start up under his teeming pen. He delighted indeed in Highland chiefs, in border thieves and murderers, in fierce

men and fierce encounters. But he had an eye to catch the stream of sweet affections, as it wound its way through humble life. What light has Jeanie Deans shed on the path of the obscure! He was too wanting in the religious sentiment, to comprehend the solemn bearing, the stern grandeur of the Puritans. But we must not charge with narrowness a writer, who embodied in a Jewish maiden his highest conceptions of female nobleness.

Another writer illustrating the liberalising, all-harmonising tendency of our times, is Dickens, whose genius has sought and found subjects of thrilling interest in the passions, sufferings, virtues of the mass of the people. He shows, that life in its rudest forms, may wear a tragic grandeur; that amidst follies and sensual excesses, provoking laughter or scorn, the moral feelings do not wholly die; and that the haunts of the blackest crimes, are sometimes lighted up by the presence and influence of the noblest souls. He has indeed greatly erred, in turning so often the degradation of humanity into matter of sport; but the tendency of his dark pictures, is to awaken sympathy with our race, to change the unfeeling indifference which has prevailed towards the depressed multitude, into sorrowful and indignant sensibility to their wrongs and woes.

The remarks now made on literature, might be extended to the Fine Arts. In these we see, too, the tendency to universality. It is said, that the spirit of the great artists has died out; but the taste for their works is spreading. By the improvements of engraving, and the invention of casts, the genius of the great masters is going abroad. Their conceptions are no longer pent up in galleries open to but few, but meet us in our homes,

and are the household pleasures of millions. Works designed for the halls and eyes of emperors, popes, and nobles, find their way, in no poor representations, into humble dwellings, and sometimes give a consciousness of kindred powers to the child of poverty. The art of drawing, which lies at the foundation of most of the fine arts, and is the best education of the eye for nature, is becoming a branch of common education, and in some countries is taught in schools to which all classes are admitted.

I am reminded, by this remark, of the most striking feature of our times, and showing its tendency to universality, and that is, the unparalleled and constantly accelerated diffusion of education. This greatest of arts, as yet little understood, is making sure progress, because its principles are more and more sought in the common nature of man; and the great truth is spreading, that every man has a right to its aid. Accordingly, education is becoming the work of nations. Even in the despotic governments of Europe, schools are open for every child without distinction; and not only the elements of reading and writing, but music and drawing are taught, and a foundation is laid for future progress in history, geography, and physical science. The greatest minds are at work on popular education. The revenues of states are applied most liberally, not to the universities for the few, but to the common schools. Undoubtedly, much remains to be done; especially a new rank in society is to be given to the teacher; but even in this respect a revolution has commenced, and we are beginning to look on the guides of the young as the chief benefactors of mankind.

I thought that I had finished my illustrations on this

point; but there has suddenly occurred to me another sign of the tendency to universal intellectual action in this country, a sign which we are prone to smile at, but which is yet worthy of notice. I refer to the commonness among us of public speaking. If we may trust our newspapers, we are a nation of orators. Every meeting overflows with eloquence. Men of all conditions find a tongue for public debate. Undoubtedly, there is more sound than sense, in our endless speeches before all kinds of assemblies and societies. But no man, I think, can attend our public meetings, without being struck with the force and propriety of expression in multitudes, whose condition has confined them to a very imperfect culture. This exercise of the intellect, which has almost become a national characteristic, is not to be undervalued. Speech is not merely the dress, as it is often called, but the very body of thought. It is to the intellect what the muscles are to the principle of physical life. The mind acts and strengthens itself through words. It is a chaos till defined, organised by language. The attempt to give clear, precise utterance to thought, is one of the most effectual processes of mental discipline. It is, therefore, no doubtful sign of the growing intelligence of a people, when the power of expression is cultivated extensively for the purpose of acting on multitudes. We have here one invaluable influence of popular institutions. They present at the same moment to a whole people great subjects of thought, and bring multitudes to the earnest discussion of them. Here are, indeed, moral dangers; but still strong incitements to general intellectual action. It is in such stirring schools, after all, that the mind of a people is chiefly formed. Events of deep general interest quicken us

more than formal teaching; and by these the civilised world is to be more and more trained to thought.

Thus, we see in the intellectual movements of our times, the tendency to expansion, to universality; and this must continue. It is not an accident, or an inexplicable result, or a violence on nature; it is founded in eternal truth. Every mind was made for growth, for knowledge; and its nature is sinned against, when it is doomed to ignorance. The divine gift of intelligence was bestowed for higher uses than bodily labour, than to make hewers of wood, drawers of water, ploughmen, or servants. Every being, so gifted, is intended to acquaint himself with God and his works, and to perform wisely and disinterestedly the duties of life. Accordingly, when we see the multitude of men beginning to thirst for knowledge, for intellectual action, for something more than an animal life, we see the great design of nature about to be accomplished; and society, having received this impulse, will never rest till it shall have taken such a form, as will place within every man's reach the means of intellectual culture. This is the revolution to which we are tending; and without this, all outward political changes would be but children's play, leaving the great work of society yet to be done.

I have now viewed the age in its intellectual aspects. If we look next at its religious movements, we shall see in these the same tendency to universality. It is more and more understood, that religious truth is every man's property and right; that it is committed to no order or individual, to no priest, minister, student, or sage, to be given or kept back at will; but that every man may, and should seek it for himself; that every man is to see with his own mind, as well as with his own eyes;

and that God's illuminating spirit is alike promised to every honest and humble seeker after truth. This recognition of every man's right of judgment, appears in the teachings of all denominations of Christians. In all, the tone of authority is giving place to that of reason and persuasion. Men of all ranks are more and more addressed, as those who must weigh and settle for themselves the grandest truths of religion.

The same tendency to universality, is seen in the generous toleration which marks our times, in comparison with the past. Men, in general, cannot now endure to think, that their own narrow church holds all the goodness on the earth. Religion is less and less regarded as a name, a form, a creed, a church, and more and more as the spirit of Christ which works under all forms and all acts. True, much intolerance remains; its separating walls are not fallen; but, with a few exceptions, they no longer reach to the clouds. Many of them have crumbled away, till the men whom they sever, can shake hands, and exchange words of fellowship, and recognise in one another's faces the features of brethren.

At the present day the grand truth of religion is more and more brought out; I mean the truth, that God is the Universal Father, that every soul is infinitely precious to him, that he has no favourites, no partial attachments, no respect of persons, that he desires alike the virtue and everlasting good of all. In the city of Penn, I cannot but remember the testimony to this truth, borne by George Fox and his followers, who planted themselves on the grand principle, that God's illuminating spirit is shed on every soul, not only within the bounds of Christendom, but through the whole earth. This universal, impartial love of God is manifested to

us more and more by science, which reveals to us vast all-pervading laws of nature, administered with no favouritism, and designed for the good of all. I know that this principle is not universally received. Men have always been inclined to frame a local, partial, national, or sectarian God, to shut up the Infinite One in some petty enclosure; but at this moment, larger views of God are so far extended, that they illustrate the spirit of the age.

If we next consider by whom religion is taught, we shall see the same tendency to diffusion and universality. Religious teaching is passing into all hands. It has ceased to be a monopoly. For example, what an immense amount of instruction is communicated in Sunday schools! These are spreading over the Christian world, and through these the door of teaching is open to crowds, to almost all indeed who would bear a part in spreading religion. In like manner, associations of vast extent are springing up in our cities for the teaching of the poor. By these means, woman especially is becoming an evangelist. She is not only a priestess in her own home, instilling with sweet loving voice the first truths of religion into the opening mind; but she goes abroad on missions of piety. Woman, in one age made man's drudge, and in another his toy, is now sharing more and more with him the highest labours. Through the press, especially, she is heard far and wide. The press is a mightier power than the pulpit. Books outstrip the voice; and woman, availing herself of this agency, becomes the teacher of nations. In churches, where she may not speak, her hymns are sung; the inspirations of her genius are felt. Thus, our age is breaking down the monopolies of the past.

But a more striking illustration remains. One of the great distinctions of our times, is found in the more clear and vital perception of the truth, that the universal impartial love, which is the glory of God, is the characteristic spirit and glory of Christianity. To this we owe the extension of philanthropic and religious effort, beyond all former experience. How much we are better, on the whole, than former times, I do not say, but that benevolence is acting on a larger scale, in more various forms, to more distant objects, this we cannot deny. Call it pretension or enthusiasm, or what you will, the fact remains; and it attests the diffusive tendencies of our times. Benevolence now gathers together her armies. Vast associations are spread over whole countries for assailing evils, which, it is thought, cannot be met by the single-handed. There is hardly a form of evil, which has not awakened some antagonist effort. Associated benevolence gives eyes to the blind and ears to the deaf, and is achieving even greater wonders; that is, it approaches the mind without the avenues of eye and ear, and gives to the hopelessly blind and deaf the invaluable knowledge which these senses afford to others. Benevolence now shuts out no human being, however low, from its regard. It goes to the cell of the criminal with words of hope, and is labouring to mitigate public punishment, to make it the instrument not of vengeance but reform. It remembers the slave, pleads his cause with God and man, recognises in him a human brother, respects in him the sacred rights of humanity, and claims for him, not as a boon but as a right, that freedom without which humanity withers and God's child is degraded into a tool or a brute. Still more, benevolence now is passing all limits of country

and ocean. It would send our own best blessing to the ends of the earth. It would make the wilderness of heathenism bloom, and join all nations in the bonds of one holy and loving faith. Thus, if we look at the religious movements of the age, we see in them that tendency to diffusion and universality, which I have named as its most striking characteristic.

Let me briefly point out this same tendency in Government. Here indeed it is too obvious for illustration. To what is the civilised world tending? To popular institutions, or, what is the same thing, to the influence of the people, of the mass of men, over public affairs. A little while ago, and the people were unknown as a power in the state. Now, they are getting all power into their hands. Even in despotisms, where they cannot act through institutions, they act through public opinion. Intelligence is strength; and in proportion as the many grow intelligent, they must guide the world. Kings and nobles fill less and less place in history; and the names of men who once were lost amidst the glare of courts and titles, are now written there imperishably. Once, history did not know that the multitude existed, except when they were gathered together on the field of battle, to be sabred and shot down for the glory of their masters. Now, they are coming forward into the foreground of her picture. It is now understood that government exists for one end, and one alone; and that is, not the glory of the governor, not the pomp and pleasure of a few, but the good, the safety, the rights of all. Once, government was an inherited monopoly, guarded by the doctrine of divine right, of an exclusive commission from the Most High. Now, office and dignity are thrown open as common things, and nations are

convulsed by the multitude of competitors for the prize of public power. Once, the policy of governments had no higher end than to concentrate property into a few hands, and to confirm the relation of dependent and lord. Now, it aims to give to each the means of acquiring property, and of carving out his fortune for himself. Such is the political current of our times. Many look on it with dark forebodings as on a desolating torrent; while others hail it as a fertilising stream. But in one thing, both agree; whether torrent or stream, the mighty current exists, and overflows, and cannot be confined; and it shows us in the political, as in the other movements of our age, the tendency to universality, to diffusion.

I shall notice but one more movement of the age as indicating the tendency to universality, and this is its industry. How numberless are the forms which this takes! Into how many channels is human labour pouring itself forth! How widely spread is the passion for acquisition, not for simple means of subsistence, but for wealth! What vast enterprises agitate the community! What a rush into all the departments of trade! How next to universal the insanity of speculation! What new arts spring up! Industry pierces the forests, and startles with her axe the everlasting silence. To you, gentlemen, commerce is the commanding interest; and this has no limits but the habitable world. It no longer creeps along the shore, or lingers in accustomed tracks, but penetrates into every inlet, plunges into the heart of uncivilised lands, sends its steam-ships up unexplored rivers, girdles the earth with railroads, and thus breaks down the estrangements of nations. Commerce is a noble calling. It mediates between distant nations,

and makes men's wants, not, as formerly, stimulants to war, but bonds of peace. The universal intellectual activity of which I have spoken, is due, in no small degree, to commerce, which spreads the thoughts, inventions, and writings of great men over the earth, and gathers scientific and literary men everywhere into an intellectual republic. So it carries abroad the missionary, the Bible, the Cross, and is giving universality to true religion. Gentlemen, allow me to express an earnest desire and hope, that the merchants of this country will carry on their calling with these generous views. Let them not pursue it for themselves alone. Let them rejoice to spread improvements far and wide, and to unite men in more friendly ties. Let them adopt maxims of trade, which will establish general confidence. Especially in their intercourse with less cultivated tribes, let them feel themselves bound to be harbingers of civilization. Let their voyages be missions of humanity, useful arts, science, and religion. It is a painful thought, that commerce, instead of enlightening and purifying less privileged communities, has too often made the name of Christian hateful to them, has carried to the savage, not our useful arts and mild faith, but weapons of war and the intoxicating draught. I call not on God to smite with his lightnings, to overwhelm with his storms the accursed ship, which goes to the ignorant, rude native, freighted with poison and death; which goes to add new ferocity to savage life, new licentiousness to savage sensuality. I have learned not to call down fire from heaven. But, in the name of humanity, of religion, of God, I implore the merchants of this country, not to use the light of a higher civilization to corrupt, to destroy our uncivilised brethren. Brethren they are in those rude

huts, in that wild attire. Establish with them an intercourse of usefulness, justice, and charity. Before they can understand the name of Christ, let them see his spirit in those by whom it is borne. It has been said, that the commerce of our country is not only corrupting uncivilised countries, but that it wears a deeper, more damning stain; that, in spite of the laws of the land and the protest of nations, it sometimes lends itself to the slave-trade; that by its capital, and accommodations, and swift sailers, and false papers, and prostituted flag, it takes part in tearing the African from his home and native shore, and in dooming him, first to the horrors of the middle passage, and then to the hopelessness of perpetual bondage. Even on men so fallen I call down no curse. May they find forgiveness from God through the pains of sincere repentance; but continuing what they are, can I help shrinking from them as among the most infamous of their race?

Allow me to say a word to the merchants of our country on another subject. The time is come, when they are particularly called to take yet more generous views of their vocation, and to give commerce a universality as yet unknown. I refer to the juster principles which are gaining ground on the subject of free trade, and to the growing disposition of nations to promote it. Free trade!—this is the plain duty and plain interest of the human race. To level all barriers to free exchange; to cut up the system of restriction, root and branch; to open every port on earth to every product; this is the office of enlightened humanity. To this a free nation should especially pledge itself. Freedom of the seas; freedom of harbours; an intercourse of nations, free as the winds; this is not a dream of philanthropists. We

are tending towards it, and let us hasten it. Under a wiser and more Christian civilization, we shall look back on our present restrictions, as we do on the swaddling bands by which, in darker times, the human body was compressed. The growing freedom of trade is another and glorious illustration of the tendency of our age to universality.

I have thus aimed to show in the principal movements of our time the character of diffusion and universality, and in doing this, I have used language implying my joy in this great feature of our age. But you will not suppose, that I see in it nothing but good. Human affairs admit no unmixed good. This very tendency has its perils and evils. To take but one example; the opening of vast prospects of wealth to the multitude of men has stirred up a fierce competition, a wild spirit of speculation, a feverish insatiable cupidity, under which fraud, bankruptcy, distrust, distress, are fearfully multiplied, so that the name of American has become a by-word beyond the ocean. I see the danger of the present state of society, perhaps as clearly as any one. But still I rejoice to have been born in this age. It is still true, that human nature was made for growth, expansion; this is its proper life, and this must not be checked because it has perils. The child, when it shoots up into youth, exchanges its early repose and security for new passions, for strong emotions, which are full of danger; but would we keep him forever a child? Danger we cannot avoid. It is a grand element of human life. We always walk on precipices. It is unmanly, unwise, it shows a want of faith in God and humanity, to deny to others and ourselves free scope and the expansion of our best powers, because of the possible collisions

and pains to be feared from extending activity. Many, indeed, sigh for security as the supreme good. But God intends us for something better, for effort, conflict, and progress. And is it not well to live in a stirring and mighty world, even though we suffer from it? If we look at outward nature, we find ourselves surrounded with vast and fearful elements, air, sea, and fire, which sometimes burst all bounds, and overwhelm man and his labours in ruin. But who of us would annihilate these awful forces, would make the ocean a standing pool, and put to silence the loud blast, in order that life may escape every peril. This mysterious, infinite, irresistible might of nature, breaking out in countless forms and motions, makes nature the true school for man, and gives it all its interest. In the soul still mightier forces are pent up, and their expansion has its perils. But all are from God, who has blended them with checks, restraints, balances, re-actions, by which all work together for good. Let us never forget, that, amidst this fearful stir, there is a paternal Providence, under which the education of our race has gone on, and a higher condition of humanity has been achieved.

There are, however, not a few, who have painful fears of evil from the restless, earnest action, which we have seen spreading itself more and more through all departments of society. They call the age wild, lawless, presumptuous, without reverence. All men, they tell us, are bursting their spheres, quitting their ranks, aspiring selfishly after gain and pre-eminence. The blind multitude are forsaking their natural leaders. The poor, who are the majority, are contriving against the rich. Still more, a dangerous fanaticism threatens

destruction to the world, under the name of Reform; society totters; property is shaken; and the universal freedom of thought and action, of which so many boast, is the precursor of social storms, which only despotism can calm. Such are the alarms of not a few; and it is right that fear should utter its prophecies, as well as hope. But it is the true office of fear, to give a wise direction to human effort, not to chill or destroy it. To despair of the race, even in the worst times, is unmanly, unchristian. How much more so in times like the present! What I most lament in these apprehensions, is the utter distrust of human nature which they discover. Its highest powers are thought to be given only to be restrained. They are thought to be safe only when in fetters. To me, there is an approach to impiety in thinking so meanly of God's greatest work. Human nature is not a tiger which needs a constant chain. In this case, it is the chain which makes the tiger. It is the oppressor, who has made man fit only for a yoke.

When I look into the great movements of the age, particularly as manifested in our own country, they seem to me to justify no overwhelming fear. True, they are earnest and wide-spreading; but the objects to which they are directed are pledges against extensive harm. For example, ought the general diffusion of science and literature and thought, to strike dread? Do habits of reading breed revolt? Does the astronomer traverse the skies, or the geologist pierce the earth, to gather materials for assault on the social state? Does the study of nature stir up rebellion against its Author? Is it the lesson which men learn from history, that they are to better their condition by

disturbing the State? Does the reading of poetry train us to insurrection? Does the diffusion of a sense of beauty through a people incline them to tumult? Are not works of genius and the fine arts soothing influences? Is not a shelf of books, in a poor man's house, some pledge of his keeping the peace? It is not denied, that thought, in its freedom, questions and assails the holiest truth. But is truth so weak, so puny, as to need to be guarded by bayonets from assault? Has truth no beauty, no might? Has the human soul no power to weigh its evidence, to reverence its grandeur? Besides, does not freedom of thought, when most unrestrained, carry a conservative power in itself. In such a state of things, the erring do not all embrace the same error. Whilst truth is one and the same, falsehood is infinitely various. It is a house divided against itself, and cannot stand. Error soon passes away, unless upheld by restraint on thought. History tells us, and the lesson is invaluable, that the physical force, which has put down free inquiry, has been the main bulwark of the superstitions and illusions of past ages.

In the next place, if we look at the chief direction of the universal activity of the age, we shall find that it is a conservative one, so as to render social convulsion next to impossible. On what, after all, are the main energies of this restlessness spent? On property, on wealth. High and low, rich and poor, are running the race of accumulation. Property is the prize for which all strain their nerves; and the vast majority compass in some measure this end. And is such a society in danger of convulsion? Is tumult the way to wealth? Is a state of insecurity coveted by men, who

own something and hope for more? Are civil laws, which, after all, have property for their chief concern, very likely to be trodden under foot by its worshippers? Of all the dreams of fear, few seem to me more baseless than the dread of anarchy among a people, who are possessed almost to a man with the passion for gain. I am especially amused, when, among such a people, I sometimes hear of danger to property and society, from enthusiastic, romantic reformers, who preach levelling doctrines, equality of wealth, quaker plainness of dress, vegetable food, and community-systems where all are to toil and divide earnings alike. What! Danger from romance and enthusiasm in this money-getting, self-seeking, self-indulging, self-displaying land! I confess, that to me it is a comfort to see some outbreak of enthusiasm, whether transcendental, philanthropic, or religious, as a proof that the human spirit is not wholly ingulfed in matter and business, that it can lift up a little the mountains of worldliness and sense with which it is so borne down. It will be time enough to fear, when we shall see fanaticism of any kind stopping ever so little the wheels of business or pleasure, driving ever so little from man's mind the idea of gain, or from woman's the love of display. Are any of you dreading an innovating enthusiasm? You need only to step into the streets to be assured, that property and the world are standing their ground against the spirit of reform, as stoutly as the most worldly man could desire.

Another view which quiets my fear as to social order from the universal activity of the times, is the fact that this activity appears so much in the form of steady labour. It is one distinction of modern over ancient times, that we have grown more patient of toil.

Our danger is from habits of drudgery. The citizens of Greece and Rome were above work. We seem to work with something of the instinct of the ant and the bee; and this is no mean security against lawlessness and revolt.

Another circumstance of our times, which favours a quiet state of things, is the love of comforts which the progress of arts and industry has spread over the community. In feudal ages and ancient times, the mass of the population had no such pleasant homes, no such defences against cold and storms, no such decent apparel, no such abundant and savoury meals, as fall to the lot of our population. Now, it must be confessed, though not very flattering to human nature, that men are very slow to part with these comforts, even in defence of a good cause, much less to throw them away in wild and senseless civil broils.

Another element of security, in the present, is the strength of domestic affection. Christianity has given new sacredness to home, new tenderness to love, new force to the ties of husband and wife, parent and child. Social order is dear to us all, as encircling and sheltering our homes. In ancient and rude times, the family bond was comparatively no restraint. We should all pause, before we put in peril beings whom we hold most dear.

Once more; Christianity is a pledge of social order which none of us sufficiently prize. Weak as its influence seems to be, there are vast numbers into whom it has infused sentiments of justice, of kindness, of reverence for God, and of deep concern for the peace and order of the State. Rapine and bloodshed would awaken now a horror altogether unknown in ages in which this

mild and divine truth had not exerted its power. With all these influences in favour of social influence, have we much to fear from the free, earnest universal movements of our times? I believe that the very extension of human powers is to bring with it new checks against their abuse.

The prosperous part of society are, of course, particularly liable to the fear of which I have spoken. They see danger especially in the extension of power and freedom of all kinds to the labouring classes of society. They look with a jealous eye on attempts to elevate these, though one would think, that to improve a man was the surest way to disarm his violence. They talk of agrarianism. They dread a system of universal pillage. They dread a conspiracy of the needy against the rich. Now the manual labourer has burdens enough to bear, without the load of groundless suspicion or reproach. It ought to be understood, that the great enemies to society, are not found in its poorer ranks. The mass may, indeed, be used as tools; but the stirring and guiding powers of insurrection are found above. Communities fall by the vices of the prosperous ranks. We are referred to Rome, which was robbed of her liberties, and reduced to the most degrading vassalage, by the lawlessness of the plebeians, who sold themselves to demagogues, and gave the republic into the hands of a dictator. But what made the plebeians an idle, dissolute, rapacious horde? It was the system of universal rapine, which, under the name of conquest, had been carried on for ages by patricians, by all the powers of the State; a system, which glutted Rome with the spoils of the pillaged world; which fed her population without labour, from the public treasures, and corrupted

them by public shows. It was this, which helped to make the metropolis of the earth a sink of crime and pollution, such as the world had never known. It was time that the grand robber-state should be cast down from her guilty eminence. Her brutish populace, which followed Cæsar's car with shouts, was not worse than the venal, crouching senate which registered his decrees. Let not the poor bear the burden of the rich. At this moment we are groaning over the depressed and dishonoured state of our country; and who, let me ask, have shaken its credit, and made so many of its institutions bankrupt? The poor, or the rich? Whence is it, that the incomes of the widow, the orphan, the aged, have been narrowed, and multitudes on both sides of the ocean brought to the brink of want? Is it from an outbreak of popular fury? Is it from gangs of thieves, sprung from the mob? We know the truth, and it shows us where the great danger to property lies.

Communities fall by the vices of the great, not the small. The French Revolution is perpetually sounded in our ears, as a warning against the lawlessness of the people. But whence came this revolution? Who were the regicides? Who beheaded Louis XVI? You tell me the Jacobins; but history tells a different tale. I will show you the beheaders of Louis XVI. They were Louis XIV. and the Regent who followed him, and Louis the XV. These brought their descendant to the guillotine. The priesthood, who revoked the edict of Nantz, and drove from France the skill and industry and virtue and piety, which were the sinews of her strength; the statesmen who intoxicated Louis XIV. with the scheme of universal empire; the pro-

fligate, prodigal, shameless Orleans; and the still more brutalised Louis the XV. with his court of panders and prostitutes; these made the nation bankrupt, broke asunder the bond of loyalty, and overwhelmed the throne and altar in ruins. We hear of the horrors of the revolution; but in this as in other things, we recollect the effect without thinking of the guiltier cause. The revolution was indeed a scene of horror; but when I look back on the reigns which preceded it, and which made Paris almost one great stew and gaming-house, and when I see altar and throne desecrated by a licentiousness unsurpassed in any former age, I look on scenes as shocking to the calm and searching eye of reason and virtue, as the 10th of August and the massacres of September. Bloodshed is indeed a terrible spectacle; but there are other things almost as fearful as blood. There are crimes that do not make us start and turn pale like the guillotine, but are deadlier in their workings. God forbid that I should say a word to weaken the thrill of horror with which we contemplate the outrages of the French revolution. But when I hear that revolution quoted to frighten us from reform, to show us the danger of lifting up the depressed and ignorant mass, I must ask whence it came? and the answer is, that it came from the intolerable weight of misgovernment and tyranny, from the utter want of culture among the mass of the people, and from a corruption of the great, too deep to be purged away except by destruction. I am also compelled to remember, that the people, in this their singular madness, wrought far less woe than kings and priests have wrought, as a familiar thing, in all ages of the world. All the murders of the French revolution did not amount, I think, by

one-fifth, to those of the "Massacre of St. Bartholomew." The priesthood and the throne, in one short night and day, shed more blood, and that the best blood of France, than was spilled by Jacobinism and all other forms of violence during the whole revolution. Even the atheism and infidelity of France were due chiefly to a licentious priesthood and a licentious court. It was religion, so called, that dug her own grave. In offering this plea for the multitude, I have no desire to transfer to the multitude uncontrolled political power. I look at power in all hands with jealousy. I wish neither rich nor poor to be my masters. What I wish is, the improvement, the elevation of all classes, and especially of the most numerous class, because the most numerous, because the many are mankind, and because no social progress can be hoped, but from influences which penetrate and raise the mass of men. The mass must not be confined and kept down through a vague dread of revolutions. A social order requiring such a sacrifice, would be too dearly bought. No order should satisfy us, but that which is in harmony with universal improvement and freedom.

In the general tone of this discourse, it may be thought, that I have proposed to vindicate the present age. I have no such thought. I would improve, not laud it. I feel its imperfections and corruptions as deeply as any, though I may be most shocked by features that give others little pain. The saddest aspect of the age, to me, is that which undoubtedly contributes to social order. It is the absorption of the multitude of men in outward material interests; it is the selfish prudence, which is never tired of the labour of accumulation, and which keeps men steady, regular, respecta-

ble drudges from morning to night. The cases of a few murders, great crimes, lead multitudes to exclaim, How wicked this age! But the worst sign is, the chaining down of almost all the minds of a community to low perishable interests. It is a sad thought, that the infinite energies of the soul have no higher end, than to cover the back, and fill the belly, and keep caste in society. A few nerves, hardly visible on the surface of the tongue, create most of the endless stir around us. Undoubtedly, eating and drinking, dressing, house-building, and caste-keeping, are matters not to be despised; most of them are essential. But surely life has a higher use, than to adorn this body which is so soon to be wrapped in grave-clothes, than to keep warm and flowing the blood which is so soon to be cold and stagnant in the tomb. I rejoice in the boundless activity of the age, and I expect much of it to be given to our outward wants. But over all this activity, there should preside the great idea of that which is alone ourselves, of our inward spiritual nature, of the thinking immortal soul, of our supreme good, our chief end, which is, to bring out, cultivate, and perfect our highest powers, to become wise, holy, disinterested, noble beings, to unite ourselves to God by love and adoration, and to revere his image in his children. The vast activity of this age of which I have spoken, is too much confined to the sensual and material, to gain and pleasure and show. Could this activity be swayed and purified by a noble aim, not a single comfort of life would be retrenched, whilst its beauty and grace and interest would be unspeakably increased.

There is another dark feature of this age. It is the spirit of collision, contention, discord, which breaks

forth in religion, in politics, in business, in private affairs; a result and necessary issue of the selfishness which prompts the endless activity of life. The mighty forces, which are this moment acting in society, are not and cannot be in harmony, for they are not governed by Love. They jar; they are discordant. Life now has little music in it. It is not only on the field of battle that men fight. They fight on the exchange. Business is war, a conflict of skill, management, and too often fraud; to snatch the prey from our neighbour is the end of all this stir. Religion is war; Christians, forsaking their one Lord, gather under various standards, to gain victory for their sects. Politics are war, breaking the whole people into fierce and unscrupulous parties, which forget their country in conflicts for office and power. The age needs nothing more than peace-makers—men of serene, commanding virtue, to preach in life and word the gospel of human brotherhood, to allay the fires of jealousy and hate.

I have named discouraging aspects of our time, to show that I am not blind to the world I live in. But I still hope for the human race. Indeed, I could not live without hope. Were I to look on the world as many do; were I to see in it a maze without a plan, a whirl of changes without aim, a stage for good and evil to fight without an issue, an endless motion without progress—a world where sin and idolatry are to triumph forever, and the oppressor's rod never to be broken, I should turn from it with sickness of heart, and care not how soon the sentence of its destruction were fulfilled. History and philosophy plainly show to me in human nature the foundation and promise of a better era, and Christianity concurs with these. The

thought of a higher condition of the world, was the secret fire which burned in the soul of the Great Founder of our religion, and in his first followers. That he was to act on all future generations, that he was sowing a seed which was to grow up and spread its branches over all nations, this great thought never forsook him in life and death. That under Christianity a civilization has grown up, containing in itself nobler elements than are found in earlier forms of society, who can deny? Great ideas and feelings, derived from this source, are now at work. Amidst the prevalence of crime and selfishness, there has sprung up in the human heart a sentiment or principle unknown in earlier ages, an enlarged and trustful philanthropy, which recognises the rights of every human being, which is stirred by the terrible oppressions and corruptions of the world, and which does not shrink from conflict with evil in its worst forms. There has sprung up, too, a faith, of which antiquity knew nothing, in the final victory of truth and right, in the elevation of men to a clearer intelligence, to more fraternal union, and to a purer worship. This faith is taking its place among the great springs of human action, is becoming even a passion in more fervent spirits. I hail it as a prophecy which is to fulfil itself. A nature capable of such an aspiration cannot be degraded forever. Ages rolled away before it was learned, that this world of matter which we tread on is in constant motion. We are beginning to learn, that the intellectual, moral, social world has its motion too, not fixed and immutable like that of matter, but one which the free-will of men is to carry on, and which, instead of returning into itself, like the earth's orbit, is to stretch forward forever.

This hope lightens the mystery and burden of life. It is a star which shines on me in the darkest night; and I should rejoice to reveal it to the eyes of my fellow-creatures.

I have thus spoken of the Present Age. In these brief words, what a world of thought is comprehended! what infinite movements! what joys and sorrows! what hope and despair! what faith and doubt! what silent grief and loud lament! what fierce conflicts and subtle schemes of policy! what private and public revolutions! In the period through which many of us have passed, what thrones have been shaken! what hearts have bled! what millions have been butchered by their fellow-creatures! what hopes of philanthropy have been blighted! and, at the same time, what magnificent enterprises have been achieved! what new provinces won to science and art! what rights and liberties secured to nations! It is a privilege to have lived in an age so stirring, so pregnant, so eventful. It is an age never to be forgotten. Its voice of warning and encouragement is never to die. Its impression on history is indelible. Amidst its events, the American revolution, the first distinct, solemn assertion of the Rights of men, and the French revolution, that volcanic force which shook the earth to its centre, are never to pass from men's minds. Over this age, the night will indeed gather more and more, as time rolls away; but in that night two forms will appear, Washington and Napoleon;—the one, a lurid meteor; the other, a benign, serene, and undecaying star. Another American name will live in history, your Franklin; and the kite, which brought lightning from Heaven, will be seen sailing in the clouds by remote posterity, when the city where he dwelt may

be known only by its ruins. There is, however, something greater in the age than its greatest men; it is the appearance of a new power in the world, the appearance of the multitude of men on that stage, where as yet the few have acted their parts alone. This influence is to endure to the end of time. What more of the present is to survive? Perhaps much, of which we now take no note. The glory of an age is often hidden from itself. Perhaps some word has been spoken in our day which we have not deigned to hear, but which is to grow clearer and louder through all ages. Perhaps some silent thinker among us is at work in his closet, whose name is to fill the earth. Perhaps there sleeps in his cradle some Reformer, who is to move the church and the world, who is to open a new era in history, who is to fire the human soul with new hope and new daring. What else is to survive the age? That which the age has little thought of, but which is living in us all; I mean the Soul, the Immortal Spirit. Of this all ages are the unfoldings, and it is greater than all. We must not feel in the contemplation of the vast movements of our own and former times, as if we ourselves were nothing. I repeat it, we are greater than all. We are to survive our age, to comprehend it, and to pronounce its sentence. As yet, however, we are encompassed with darkness. The issues of our time how obscure! The future into which it opens, who of us can foresee? To the Father of all Ages I commit this future, with humble yet courageous and unfaltering hope.

THE

DUTY OF THE FREE STATES,

OR

REMARKS

SUGGESTED BY

THE CASE OF THE CREOLE.

THE

DUTY OF THE FREE STATES, &c.

I respectfully ask your attention, fellow-citizens of the Free States, to a subject of great and pressing importance. The case of the Creole, taken by itself, or separated from the principles which are complicated with it, however it might engage my feelings, would not have moved me to the present address. I am not writing to plead the cause of a hundred or more men, scattered through the West Indies, and claimed as slaves. In a world abounding with so much wrong and woe, we at this distance can spend but a few thoughts on these strangers. I rejoice that they are free; I trust that they will remain so; and with these feelings, I dismiss them from my thoughts. The case of the Creole involves great and vital principles, and as such I now invite to it your serious consideration.

The case is thus stated in the letter of the American Secretary of State, to the American Minister in London:—

"It appears that the brig Creole, of Richmond, Virginia, Ensor, master, bound to New-Orleans, sailed from Hampton Roads with a cargo of merchandise, principally tobacco and slaves, about one hundred and thirty-five in number. That, on the evening of the

7th of November, some of the slaves rose upon the crew of the vessel, murdered a passenger named Hewell, who owned some of the negroes, wounded the captain dangerously, and the first mate and two of the crew severely. That the slaves soon obtained complete possession of the brig, which, under their direction, was taken into the port of Nassau, in the Island of New Providence, where she arrived on the morning of the 9th of the same month: that, at the request of the American consul in that place, the governor ordered a guard on board to prevent the escape of the mutineers, and with a view to an investigation of the circumstances of the case: that such investigation was accordingly made by two British magistrates, and that an examination also took place by the consul: that, on the report of the magistrates, nineteen of the slaves were imprisoned by the local authorities, as having been concerned in the mutiny and murder: and their surrender to the consul, to be sent to the United States for trial for these crimes, was refused, on the ground, that the governor wished first to communicate with the government in England on the subject: that, through the interference of the colonial authorities, and even before the military guard was removed, the greater number of the slaves were liberated, and encouraged to go beyond the power of the master of the vessel, or the American consul, by proceedings which neither of them could control. This is the substance of the case, as stated in two protests, one made at Nassau, and one at New-Orleans, and the consul's letters, together with sundry depositions taken by him, copies of all which are herewith transmitted."

This statement of the case of the Creole, is derived chiefly from the testimony of the officers and crew of the vessel, and very naturally falls under suspicion of being coloured, in part, by prejudice and passion. We must hear the other side, and compare all the witnesses, before we can understand the whole case. The main facts, however, cannot be misunderstood. The shipping of the slaves at Norfolk, the rising of a part of their number against the officers of the vessel, the success of the insurrection, the carrying of the vessel into the port of Nassau, and the recognition and treatment of the

slaves as free by the British authorities of that place; these material points of the case cannot be questioned.

The letter of our government, stating these facts as grounds of complaint against England, is written with much caution, and seems wanting in the tone of earnestness and confidence which naturally belongs to a good cause. It does not go to the heart of the case. It relies more on the comity of nations, than on principles of justice and natural law. Still, in one respect, it is decided. It protests against, and complains of, the British authorities, and "calls loudly for redress." It maintains, that "it was the plain and obvious duty" of the authorities at Nassau, to give aid and succour to the officers of the Creole in reducing the slaves to subjection, in resuming their voyage with their cargo of men as well as of tobacco, and in bringing the insurgents to trial in this country. It maintains, that the claims of the American masters to their slaves existed, and were in force in the British port, and that these claims ought to have been acknowledged and sustained by the British magistrate. The plain inference is, that the government of the United States is bound to spread a shield over American slavery abroad as well as at home. Such is the letter.

This document I propose to examine, and I shall do so chiefly for two reasons: First, because it maintains morally unsound and pernicious doctrines, and is fitted to deprave the public mind; and, secondly, because it tends to commit the Free States to the defence and support of slavery. This last point is at this moment of peculiar importance. The Free States are gradually and silently coming more and more into connection with slavery; are unconsciously learning to regard it as

a national interest; and are about to pledge their wealth and strength, their bones and muscles and lives, to its defence. Slavery is mingling more and more with the politics of the country, determining more and more the individuals who shall hold office, and the great measures on which the public weal depends. It is time for the Free States to wake up to the subject; to weigh it deliberately; to think of it, not casually, when some startling fact forces it up into notice, but with earnest, continued, solemn attention; to inquire into their duties in regard to it; to lay down their principles; to mark out their course; and to resolve on acquitting themselves righteously towards God, towards the South, and towards themselves. The North has never come to this great matter in earnest. We have trifled with it. We have left things to take their course. We have been too much absorbed in pecuniary interests, to watch the bearing of slavery on the government. Perhaps we have wanted the spirit, the manliness, to look the subject fully in the face. Accordingly, the slave-power has been allowed to stamp itself on the national policy, and to fortify itself with the national arm. For the pecuniary injury to our prosperity, which may be traced to this source, I care little or nothing. There is a higher view of the case. There is a more vital question to be settled than that of interest, the question of duty; and to this my remarks will be confined.

The letter which is now to be examined, may be regarded either as the work of an individual, or as the work of the government. I shall regard it in the latter light alone. Its personal bearings are of no moment. No individual will enter my thoughts in this discussion. I regard the letter as issuing from the cabinet, as an

Executive document, as laying down the principles to which the public policy is in danger of being conformed, as fitted to draw the whole country into support of an institution which the Free States abhor. With the opinions of an individual, I have nothing to do. Corrupt principles adopted by the government—these and these alone it will be my object to expose.

There is a difficulty lying at the threshold of such a discussion, which I should be glad to remove. A northern man writing on slavery is supposed to write as a northern man, to be swayed by state feelings and local biasses; and the distrust thus engendered is a bar to the conviction which he might otherwise produce. But the prejudices which grow out of the spot where we live, are far from being necessary or universal. There are persons whose peculiarity, perhaps whose infirmity it is, to be exceedingly alive to evils in their neighbourhood, to defects in the state of society in which they live, whilst their imaginations are apt to cast rosy hues over distant scenes. There are persons who, by living in retirement and holding intercourse with gifted minds in other regions, are even in danger of wanting a proper local attachment, and of being unjust to their own homes. There are also worthier causes, which counteract the bigotry of provincial feelings. A man, then, is not necessarily presumptuous in thinking himself free from local biasses. In truth, slavery never presents itself to me as belonging to one or another part of the country. It does not come to me in its foreign relations. I regard it simply and nakedly in itself, and on this account feel that I have a right to discuss it.

May I be allowed one more preliminary remark? The subject of slavery is separated in my mind, not

only from local considerations, but from all thought of the individuals by whom it is sustained. I speak against this institution freely, earnestly, some may think, vehemently; but I have no thought of attaching the same reproach to all who uphold it; and this I say, not to propitiate the slave-holder, who cannot easily forgive the irreconcileable enemy of his wrong-doing, but to meet the prepossessions of not a few among ourselves, who, from esteem towards the slave-holder, repel what seems to them to involve an assault on his character. I do indeed use, and cannot but use, strong language against slavery. No greater wrong, no grosser insult on humanity, can well be conceived; nor can it be softened by the customary plea of the slave-holder's kindness. The first and most essential exercise of love towards a human being, is to respect his Rights. It is idle to talk of kindness to a human being, whose rights we habitually trample under foot. "Be just before you are generous." A human being is not to be loved as a horse or a dog, but as a being having rights; and his first grand right is that of free action; the right to use and expand his powers; to improve and obey his higher faculties; to seek his own and others' good; to better his lot; to make himself a home; to enjoy inviolate the relations of husband and parent; to live the life of a man. An institution denying to a being this right, and virtually all rights; which degrades him into a chattel, and puts him beneath the level of his race, is more shocking to a calm, enlightened philanthropy, than most of the atrocities which we shudder at in history; and this for a plain reason. These atrocities, such as the burning of heretics, and the immolation of the Indian woman on the funeral pile of her husband,

have generally some foundation in ideas of duty and religion. The inquisitor murders to do God service; and the Hindoo widow is often fortified against the flames by motives of inviolable constancy and generous self-sacrifice. The Indian in our wilderness, when he tortures his captives, thinks of making an offering, of making compensation, to his own tortured friends. But in slavery, man seizes his brother, subjects him to brute force, robs him of all his rights, for purely selfish ends—as selfishly as the robber fastens on his prey. No generous affections, no ideas of religion and self-sacrifice throw a gleam of light over its horrors. As such, I must speak of slavery, when regarded in its own nature, and especially when regarded in its origin. But when I look on a community among whom this evil exists, but who did not originate it; who grew up in the midst of it; who connect it with parents and friends; who see it intimately entwined with the whole system of domestic, social, industrial, and political life; who are blinded by long habit to its evils and abuses; and who are alarmed by the possible evils of the mighty change involved in its abolition; I shrink from passing on such a community the sentence which is due to the guilty institution. All history furnishes instances of vast wrongs inflicted, of cruel institutions upheld by nations or individuals, who in other relations manifest respect for duty. That slavery has a blighting moral influence where it exists, is indeed unquestionable; but in that bad atmosphere, so much that is good and pure may and does grow up, as to forbid us to deny esteem and respect to a man, simply because he is a slaveholder. I offer these remarks because I wish that the subject may be approached without the association of

it with individuals, parties, or local divisions, which blind the mind to the truth.

I now return to the executive document with which I began. I am first to consider its doctrines, to show their moral unsoundness and inhumanity; and then I shall consider the bearing of these doctrines on the Free States in general, and the interest which the Free States have at this critical moment in the subject of slavery. Thus my work divides itself into two parts, the first of which is now offered to the public.

In regard to the reasonings and doctrines of the document, it is a happy circumstance that they come within the comprehension of the mass of the people. The case of the Creole is a simple one, which requires no extensive legal study to be understood. A man who has had little connection with public affairs, is as able to decide on it as the bulk of politicians. The elements of the case are so few, and the principles on which its determination rests are so obvious, that nothing but a sound moral judgment is necessary to the discussion. Nothing can darken it but legal subtlety. None can easily doubt it, but those who surrender conscience and reason to arbitrary rules.

The question between the American and English governments turns mainly on one point. The English government does not recognise within its bounds any property in man. It maintains that slavery rests wholly on local municipal legislation; that it is an institution not sustained and enforced by the law of nature, and still more, that it is repugnant to this law; and that, of course, no man who enters the territory or is placed under the jurisdiction of England, can be regarded as a slave, but must be treated as free. The law creating

slavery, it is maintained, has and can have no force beyond the State which creates it. No other nation can be bound by it. Whatever validity this ordinance, which deprives a man of all his rights, may have within the jurisdiction of the community in which it had its birth, it can have no validity anywhere else. This is the principle on which the English government founds itself.

This principle is so plain, that it has been established and is acted upon among ourselves, and in the neighbouring British provinces. When a slave is brought by his master into Massachusetts, he is pronounced free, on the ground that the law of slavery has no force beyond the State which ordains it, and that the right of every man to liberty is recognised as one of the fundamental laws of the commonwealth. A slave flying from his master to this commonwealth is indeed restored, but not on account of the validity of the legislation of the South on this point, but solely on the ground of a positive provision of the constitution of the United States; and he is delivered, not as a slave but as a "person held to service by law in another State." We should not think for a moment of restoring a slave flying to us from Cuba or Turkey. We recognise no right of a foreign master on this soil. The moment he brings his slave here, his claim vanishes into air; and this takes place because we recognise freedom as the right of every human being.

By the provision of the constitution, as we have said, the fugitive slave from the South is restored by us, or at least his master's claim is not annulled. But we have proof at our door, that this exception rests on positive, not natural law. Suppose the fugitive to pass through

our territory undiscovered, and to reach the soil of Canada. The moment he touches it, he is free. The master finds there an equal in his slave. The British authority extends the same protection over both. Accordingly, a colony of fugitive slaves is growing up securely beyond our border, in the enjoyment of all the rights of British subjects. And this good work has been going on for years, without any complaint against England as violating national law, or without any claim for compensation. These are plain facts. We ourselves construe the law of nature and nations as England does.

But the question is not to be settled on the narrow ground of precedent alone. Let us view it in the light of eternal universal truth. A grand principle is involved in the case, or rather lies at its very foundation, and to this I ask particular attention. This principle is, that a man, as a man, has rights, has claims on his race, which are in no degree touched or impaired on account of the manner in which he may be regarded or treated by a particular clan, tribe, or nation of his fellow-creatures. A man, by his very nature, as an intelligent, moral creature of God, has claims to aid and kind regard from all other men. There is a grand law of humanity, more comprehensive than all others, and under which every man should find shelter. He has not only a right, but is bound to use freely and improve the powers which God has given him; and other men, instead of obstructing, are bound to assist their development and exertion. These claims a man does not derive from the family or tribe in which he began his being. They are not the growth of a particular soil; they are not ripened under a peculiar sky; they are not written on a particular complexion; they belong to human na-

ture. The ground on which one man asserts them, all men stand on, nor can they be denied to one without being denied to all. We have here a common interest. We must all stand or fall together. We all have claims on our race, claims of kindness and justice, claims grounded on our relation to our common Father and on the inheritance of a common nature.

Because a number of men invade the rights of a fellow-creature, and pronounce him destitute of rights, his claims are not a whit touched by this. He is as much a man as before. Not a single gift of God, on which his rights rest, is taken away. His relations to the rest of his race are in no measure affected. He is as truly their brother as if his tribe had not pronounced him a brute. If indeed any change takes place, his claims are enhanced, on the ground that the suffering and injured are entitled to peculiar regard. If any rights should be singularly sacred in our sight, they are those which are denied and trodden in the dust.

It seems to be thought by some, that a man derives all his rights from the nation to which he belongs. They are gifts of the State, and the State may take them away, if it will. A man, it is thought, has claims on other men not as a man, but as an Englishman, an American, or a subject of some other State. He must produce *his* parchment of citizenship, before he binds other men to protect *him*, to respect his free agency, to leave him the use of his powers according to his own will. Local, municipal law is thus made the fountain and measure of rights. The stranger must tell us where he was born, what privileges he enjoyed at home, or no tie links us to one another.

In conformity to these views, it is thought that when

one community declares a man to be a slave, other communities must respect this decree; that the duties of a foreign nation to an individual are to be determined by a brand set on him on his own shores; that his relations to the whole race may be affected by the local act of a community, no matter how small or how unjust.

This is a terrible doctrine. It strikes a blow at all the rights of human nature. It enables the political body to which we belong, no matter how wicked or weak, to make each of us an outcast from his race. It makes a man nothing in himself. As a man, he has no significance. He is sacred only as far as some State has taken him under its care. Stripped of his nationality, he is at the mercy of all who may incline to lay hold on him. He may be seized, imprisoned, sent to work in galleys or mines, unless some foreign State spreads its shield over him as one of its citizens.

This doctrine is as false as it is terrible. Man is not the mere creature of the State. Man is older than nations, and he is to survive nations. There is a law of humanity more primitive and divine than the law of the land. He has higher claims than those of a citizen. He has rights which date before all charters and communities; not conventional, not repealable, but as eternal as the powers and laws of his being.

This annihilation of the individual, by merging him in the State, lies at the foundation of despotism. The nation is too often the grave of the man. This is the more monstrous, because the very end of the State, of the organization of the nation, is to secure the individual in all his rights, and especially to secure the rights of the weak. Here is the fundamental idea of political association. In an unorganised society, with no legis-

lation, no tribunal, no umpire, rights have no security. Force predominates over right. This is the grand evil of what is called the state of nature. To repress this, to give right the ascendancy over force, this is the grand idea and end of government, of country, of political constitutions. And yet we are taught that it depends on the law of a man's country, whether he shall have rights, and whether other States shall regard him as a man. When cast on a foreign shore, his country, and not his humanity, is to be inquired into, and the treatment he receives is to be proportioned to what he meets at home.

Men worship power, worship great organizations, and overlook the individual; and few things have depraved the moral sentiment of men more, or brought greater woes on the race. The State, or the ruler in whom the State is embodied, continues to be worshipped, notwithstanding the commission of crimes which would inspire horror in the private man. How insignificant are the robberies, murders, piracies, which the law makes capital, in comparison with an unjust or unnecessary war, dooming thousands, perhaps millions, of the innocent to the most torturing forms of death, or with the law of an autocrat or of a public body, depriving millions of all the rights of men! But these, because the acts of the State, escape the execrations of the world.

In consequence of this worship of governments, it is thought that their relations to one another are alone important. A government is too great to look at a stranger, except as he is incorporated with some State. It can have nothing to do but with political organizations like itself. But the humble stranger has a claim

on it as sacred as another State. Standing alone, he yet has rights, and to violate them is as criminal as to violate stipulations with a foreign power. In one view it is baser. It is as true of governments as of individuals, that it is base and unmanly to trample on the weak. He who invades the strong shows a courage which does something to redeem his violence; but to tread on the neck of a helpless, friendless fellow-creature, is to add meanness to wrong.

If the doctrine be true, that the character impressed on a man at home follows him abroad, and that he is to be regarded not as a man, but as the local laws which he has left regard him, why shall not this apply to the peculiar advantages as well as disadvantages which a man enjoys in his own land? Why shall not he, whom the laws invest with a right to universal homage at home, receive the same tribute abroad? Why shall not he, whose rank exempts him from the ordinary restraints of law on his own shores, claim the same lawlessness elsewhere? Abroad these distinctions avail him nothing. The local law which makes him a kind of deity, deserts him the moment he takes a step beyond his country's borders; and why shall the disadvantages, the terrible wrongs, which that law inflicts, follow the poor sufferer to the end of the earth?

I repeat it, for the truth deserves reiteration, that all nations are bound to respect the rights of every human being. This is God's law, as old as the world. No local law can touch it. No ordinance of a particular State, degrading a set of men to chattels, can absolve all nations from the obligation of regarding the injured beings as men, or bind them to send back the injured to their chains. The character of a slave, attached to

a man by a local government, is not and cannot be incorporated into his nature. It does not cling to him, go where he will. The scar of slavery on his back does not reach his soul. The arbitrary relation between him and his master cannot suspend the primitive indestructible relation by which God binds him to his kind.

The idea that a particular State may fix, enduringly, this stigma on a human being, and can bind the most just and generous men to respect it, should be rejected with scorn and indignation. It reminds us of those horrible fictions, in which some demon is described as stamping an indelible mark of hell on his helpless victims. It was the horrible peculiarity of the world in the reign of Tiberius, that it had become one vast prison. The unhappy man, on whom the blighting suspicion of the tyrant had fallen, could find no shelter or escape through the whole civilised regions of the globe. Everywhere his sentence followed him like fate. And can the law of a despot, or of a chamber of despots, extend now the same fearful doom to the ends of the earth? Can a little State at the South spread its web of cruel, wrongful legislation over both continents? Do all communities become spell-bound by a law in a single country creating slavery? Must they become the slave's jailers? Must they be less merciful than the storm which drives off the bondman from the detested shore of servitude, and casts him on the soil of freedom? Must even that soil become tainted by an ordinance passed perhaps in another hemisphere? Has oppression this terrible omnipresence? Must the whole earth register the slaveholders' decree? Then the earth is blighted indeed. Then, as some ancient sects taught, it is truly the em-

pire of the Principle of Evil, of the Power of Darkness. Then God is dethroned here; for where injustice and oppression are omnipotent, God has no empire.

I have thus stated the great principle on which the English authorities acted in the case of the Creole, and on which all nations are bound to act. Slavery is the creature of a local law, having power not a hand-breadth beyond the jurisdiction of the country which ordains it. Other nations know nothing of it, are bound to pay it no heed. I might add, that other nations are bound to tolerate it within the bounds of a particular State, only on the grounds on which they suffer a particular State to establish bloody superstitions, to use the rack in jurisprudence, or to practise other enormities. They might much more justifiably put down slavery where it exists, than enforce a foreign slave-code within their own bounds. Such is the impregnable principle which we of the Free States should recognise and earnestly sustain.*

This principle our government has not explicitly denied in its letter to our minister in London. The letter is chiefly employed in dilating on various particular circumstances, which it is said entitled the Creole to assistance from the British authorities, in the prosecution of the voyage with her original freight and passengers. The strength of the document lies altogether in the skilful manner in which these circumstances are put together. I shall therefore proceed to consider them with some minuteness. They are briefly these. The vessel was engaged in a voyage "perfectly lawful." She was taken to a British port, "not voluntarily by those who had the lawful authority

* See Note A.

over her," but forcibly and violently "against the master's will," without any agency or solicitation on the part of the great majority of the slaves, and indeed solely by the few "mutineers" who had gained possession of her by violence and bloodshed. The slaves were "still on board" the American vessel. They had not become "incorporated with the English population;" and from these facts it is argued, that they had not changed their original character, that the vessel containing them ought to have been regarded as "still on her voyage," and should have been aided to resume it according to that law of comity and hospitality by which nations are bound to aid one another's vessels in distress.

It is encouraging to see in this reasoning of the letter, a latent acknowledgment, that, had the vessel been carried with the slaves into the British port by the free will of the captain, the slaves would have been entitled to liberty. The force and crime involved in the transaction, form the strength of the case as stated by ourselves. The whole tone of the communication undesignedly recognises important rights in a foreign State in regard to slaves carried voluntarily to their shores; and by this concession it virtually abandons the whole ground.

But let us look at the circumstances, which it is said bound the British authorities to assist the captain in sending back the slaves to their chains; and one general remark immediately occurs. These circumstances do not touch, in the slightest degree, the great principle on which the authorities were bound by British and natural law to act. This principle, as we have stated, is, that a nation is bound by the law of nature

to respect the rights of every human being, that every man within its jurisdiction is entitled to its protection as long as he obeys its laws, that the private individual may appeal to the broad law of humanity, and claim hospitality as truly as a State.

Now, how did the peculiar circumstances of the Creole bear on this fundamental view of the case? Did the manner in which the slaves of the Creole were carried to Nassau, in any measure affect their character as men? Did they cease to be men, because the ship was seized by violence, the captain imprisoned, and the vessel turned from its original destination? Did the shifting of the vessel's course by a few points of the compass, or did the government of the helm by a "mutineer," transmute a hundred or more men into chattels? To the eye of the British officer, the slaves looked precisely as they would have done had they been brought to the island by any other means. He could see nothing but human beings, and no circumstances leaving this character on them could have authorised him to deny them human rights. It mattered nothing to him how they came to the island; for this did not touch at all the ground of their claim to protection.

A case indeed is imagined in the document, in which it is said that the manner of transportation of slaves to a foreign port, must determine the character in which they shall be viewed. "Suppose an American vessel with slaves lawfully on board were to be captured by a British cruiser, as belonging to some belligerent, while the United States were at peace; suppose such prize carried into England, and the neutrality of the vessel fully made out in the proceedings in Admiralty, and a

restoration consequently decreed; in such case, must not the slaves be restored exactly in the condition in which they were when the capture was made? Would any one contend, that the fact of their having been carried into England by force, set them free?" I reply, undoubtedly they would be free the moment they should enter English jurisdiction. A writ of habeas corpus could and would and must be granted them, if demanded by themselves or their friends, and no court would dare to remit them to their chains; and this is not only English law, but in the spirit of universal law. In this case, however, compensation would undoubtedly be made by the captors for the slaves, not on the ground of any claim in the slaveholder, but because of the original wrong by the captors, and of their consequent obligation to replace the vessel as much as possible in the condition in which she was found, at the moment of being seized on the open ocean, where she was captured on groundless suspicion, where she had a right to prosecute her voyage without obstruction, and whence she ought not to have been brought by the capturing State within its jurisdiction and made subject to its laws.

Let us now consider particularly the circumstances on which the United States maintain that the British authorities were bound to replace the slaves under the master of the Creole, and violated their duty in setting them free.

It is insisted, first, that "the Creole was passing from one port to another in a voyage *perfectly lawful.*" We cannot but lament that to sustain this point of the *lawfulness* of the voyage, it is affirmed that "slaves are recognised as property by the constitution of the

United States in those States in which slavery exists." Were this true, it is one of those truths which respect for our country should prevent our intruding on the notice of strangers. A child should throw a mantle over the nakedness of his parent. But the language seems to me stronger than the truth. The constitution was intended not to interfere with the laws of property in the States where slaves had been held. But the recognition of a moral right in the slave-holder is most carefully avoided in that instrument. Slaves are three times referred to, but always as *persons*, not as *property*. The Free States are indeed bound to deliver up fugitive slaves; but these are to be surrendered not as slaves, but as "persons held to service." The clause applies as much to fugitive apprentices from the North, as to fugitive slaves from the South. The history of this clause is singular. In the first draught of the constitution it stood thus: "No person legally held to service or labour in one State, escaping into another, shall in consequence of any law or regulation thereof, be discharged from such service or labour, but shall be delivered up," &c. Mr. Madison tells us that the term "legally" was struck out, and the words "under the laws thereof," were inserted after the word "State," in compliance with the wish of some, "who thought the term *legal* equivocal, and favouring the idea that slavery was *legal in a moral point of view*."* It ought also to be added, that in the debate in the convention on that clause of the constitution which conferred power on Congress to abolish the importation of slaves in 1808, "Mr. Madison thought it wrong to admit in the constitution the idea that there could be property

* Madison papers, p. 1589.

in men."* Most memorable testimony to the truth from this greatest constitutional authority! With the knowledge of these facts, our government had no apology for holding up the great national charter as recognising property in man. The phraseology and history of the constitution afford us some shelter, however insufficient, from the moral condemnation of the world; and we should not gratuitously cast it away.

Whilst, however, we censure this clause in the Executive Document, we rejoice that on one point it is explicit. It affirms that "slaves are recognised as property by the constitution of the United States, *in those States in which slavery exists.*" Here we have the limit precisely defined, within which the constitution spreads its shield over slavery. These limits are "the States in which slavery exists." Beyond these it recognises no property in *man*, and of course beyond these it cannot take this property under its protection. The moment the slave leaves the States within which slavery exists, the constitution knows nothing of him as property. Of consequence, the national government has no right to touch the case of the Creole. As soon as that vessel passed beyond the jurisdiction of the State where she received her passengers, the slaves ceased to be property in the eye of the constitution. The national authorities were no longer bound to interfere with and to claim them as such. The nation's force was no longer pledged to subject them to their masters. Its relation to them had wholly ceased. On this point we are bound to adopt the strictest construction of the instrument. The Free States should not suffer them-

* Madison papers, p. 1429.

selves to be carried a hair's breadth beyond the line, within which they are pledged to the dishonourable office of protecting slavery.

But, leaving this clause, I return to the first consideration adduced to substantiate the claim of the Creole to the assistance of the British authorities. The voyage, we are told, was "perfectly lawful." Be it so. But this circumstance, according to the principles of the Free States, involves no obligation of another community to enforce slavery or to withhold from the slave the rights of a man. Suppose that the Creole had sailed to Massachusetts with her slaves. The voyage would have been "lawful;" but on entering the port of Boston her slaves would have been pronounced free. The "right of property" in them conferred by a slave state, would have ceased. The lawfulness of the voyage, then, gives the slave-holder no claim on another government, into the ports of which his slave may be carried.

Again, what is meant by the "perfect lawfulness" of the voyage? Does it mean that the Creole shipped the slaves under the law of nature or the law of Great Britain? Certainly not; but solely under the law of America; so that the old question recurs, Whether a local municipal law, authorising an American vessel to convey slaves, binds all nations to whose territory these unhappy persons may be carried, to regard them as property, to treat them as the Parias of the human race? This is the simple question, and one not hard of solution.

"The voyage was perfectly lawful," we are told. So would be the voyage of a Turkish ship freighted with Christian slaves from Constantinople. Suppose

such a vessel driven by storms or carried by force into a Christian port. Would any nation in Europe, or would America feel itself bound to assist the Turkish slaver, to replace the chains on Christian captives whom the elements or their own courage had set free, to sacrifice to the comity and hospitality and usages of nations, the law of humanity and Christian brotherhood?

"The voyage," we are told, "was perfectly lawful." Suppose now, that a slave-holding country should pass a law ordaining and describing a chain as a badge of bondage, and authorising the owner to carry about his slave fastened to himself by this sign of property. Suppose the master to go with slave and chain to a foreign country. His journey would be "lawful;" but would the foreign government be bound to respect this ordinance of the distant State? Would the authorised chain establish property in the slave over the whole earth? We know it would not; and why should the authorised vessel impose a more real obligation?

It seems to be supposed by some, that there is a peculiar sacredness in a vessel, which exempts it from all control in the ports of other nations. A vessel is sometimes said to be "an extension of the territory" to which it belongs. The nation, we are told, is present in the vessel; and its honour and rights are involved in the treatment which its flag receives abroad. These ideas are in the main true, in regard to ships on the high seas. The sea is the exclusive property of no nation. It is subject to none. It is the common and equal property of all. No State has jurisdiction over it. No State can write its laws on that restless surface. A ship at sea carries with her, and represents the rights of her country, rights equal to those which any other

enjoys. The slightest application of the laws of another nation to her is to be resisted. She is subjected to no law but that of her own country, and to the law of nations, which presses equally on all States. She may thus be called, with no violence to language, an extension of the territory to which she belongs. But suppose her to quit the open sea and enter a port, what a change is produced in her condition! At sea she sustained the same relations to all nations, those of an equal. Now she sustains a new and peculiar relation to the nation which she has entered. She passes at once under its jurisdiction; she is subject to its laws; she is entered by its officers. If a criminal flies to her for shelter, he may be pursued and apprehended. If her own men violate the laws of the land, they may be seized and punished. The nation is not present in her. She has left the open highway of the ocean, where all nations are equals, and entered a port where one nation alone is clothed with authority. What matters it that a vessel in the harbour of Nassau is owned in America? This does not change her locality. She has contracted new duties and obligations by being placed under a new jurisdiction. Her relations differ essentially from those which she sustained at home or on the open sea. These remarks apply of course to merchant vessels alone. A ship of war is "an extension of the territory" to which she belongs, not only when she is on the ocean, but in a foreign port. In this respect she resembles an army marching by consent through a neutral country. Neither ship of war nor army falls under the jurisdiction of foreign States. Merchant vessels resemble individuals. Both become subject to the laws of the land which they enter.

We are now prepared to consider the next circumstance on which much stress is laid, to substantiate the claim of our government. "The vessel was taken to a British port, not voluntarily by those who had the lawful authority over her, but forcibly and violently, against the master's will, by mutineers and murderers," &c.

To this, various replies are contained in the preceding remarks. The first is, that the local laws of one country are not transported to another, and do not become of force there, because a vessel of the former is carried by violence into the ports of the latter. Another is, that a vessel entering the harbour of a foreign State, through mutiny or violence, is not on this account exempted from its jurisdiction or laws. She may not set its authorities at defiance, because brought within its waters against her own will. There may, indeed, be local laws intended to exclude foreigners, which it would be manifestly unjust and inhuman to enforce on such as may be driven to the excluding State against their own consent. But as to the laws of a country founded on the universal principles of justice and humanity, these are binding on foreign vessels, under whatever circumstances they may be brought within its jurisdiction. There is still another view of this subject, which I have already urged, but which is so important as to deserve repetition. The right of the slaves of the Creole to liberation, was not at all touched by the mode in which they were brought to Nassau. No matter how they got there, whether by sea, land, or air, whether by help of saint or sinner. A man's right to freedom is derived from none of these accidents, but inheres in him as a man, and nothing which does not touch his humanity can impair it. The slaves of the

Creole were not a whit the less men, because "mutiny" had changed their course on the ocean. They stood up in the port of Nassau with all the attributes of men, and the government could not, without wrong, have denied their character and corresponding claims.

We are now prepared for the consideration of another circumstance in the case of the Creole, on which stress is laid. We are told by our government, that they were "still in the ship," when they were declared free, and on this account their American character, that is, the character of slavery adhered to them. This is a view of the case more fitted perhaps than any other, to impress the inconsiderate. The slaves had not changed their position, had not touched the shore. The vessel was American. They trod on American planks; they slept within American walls. They, of course, belonged to America, and were to be viewed only in their American character. To this reasoning the principles already laid down, furnish an easy answer. It is true that the slaves were in an American ship; but there is another truth still more pregnant; they were also in another country, where American law has no power. The vessel had not carried America to the port of Nassau. The slaves had changed countries. What though they were there in an American ship? They were therefore not the less within English territory and English jurisdiction. The two or three inches of plank, which separated them from the waves, had no miraculous power to prevent them from being where they were. The water which embosomed the vessel was English. The air they breathed was English. The laws under which they had passed were English. One would think from the reasoning to which I am

replying, that the space occupied by a vessel in a foreign port is separated for a time from the country to which it formerly belonged; that it takes the character of the vessel, and falls under the laws of the land to which she appertains; that the authorities which have controlled it for ages must not enter it, whilst the foreign planks are floating in it, to repress crime or enforce justice. But this is all a fiction. The slaves, whilst in the ship, were in a foreign country, as truly as if they had plunged into the waves or set foot on shore.

We will now consider another circumstance to which importance is attached in the Document of our Executive. We are told that "the slaves could not be regarded as having become mixed up or incorporated with the British population, or as having changed character at all, either in regard to country or personal condition." To this it is replied, that no one pretends that the slaves had become Englishmen, or had formed a special relation to Great Britain, on account of which she was compelled to liberate them. It was not as a part of the British population that they were declared free. Had the authorities at Nassau taken this ground, they might have been open to the complaints of our government. The slaves were pronounced free, not because of any national character which they sustained, but because they were men, and because Great Britain held itself bound to respect the law of nature with regard to men. It was not necessary for them to be incorporated with the British population, in order to acquire the common rights of human beings. One great error in the Document is, that a government is supposed to owe nothing to a human being who lands

on its shores, any farther than his nation may require. It is thought to have nothing to do, but to inquire into his nationality, and to fulfil the obligations which this imposes. He has no rights to set up, unless his own government stand by him. Thus, the fundamental principles of the law of nature are set at naught. Thus, all rights are resolved into benefactions of the State, and man is nothing unless incorporated, mixed up with the population of a particular country. This doctrine is too monstrous to be openly avowed, but it lies at the foundation of most of the reasonings of the Document. The man, I repeat it, is older and more sacred than the citizen. The slave of the Creole had no other name to take. His own country had declared him not to be a citizen. He had been scornfully refused a place among the American people. He was only a Man; and was that a low title on which to stand up among men? Nature knows no higher on earth. English law knows no higher. Shall we find fault with a country, because an outcast man landing on its shore is declared free, without the formality of becoming incorporated with its population?

The slaves, we are told in the argument which we are considering, as they had no claim to be considered as mixed up with the British population, had not therefore changed their character either in regard to "country or condition." The old sophistry reigns here. It is taken for granted that a man has no character but that of country and condition. In other words, he must be regarded by foreign States as belonging to a particular nation, and treated according to this view, and no other. Now the truth is, that there is a primitive, indelible "character" fastened on a man far more im-

portant than that of "country or condition;" and looking at this, I joyfully accord with our Cabinet in saying, that the slaves of the Creole did not "change their character" by touching British soil. There they stood with the character which God impressed on them, and which man can never efface. The British authorities gave them no new character, but simply recognised that which they had worn from the day of their birth, the only one which cannot pass away.

I have now considered all the circumstances stated in the Document as grounds of complaint, with one exception, and this I have deferred on account of its uncertainty, and in the hope of obtaining more satisfactory information. The circumstance is this, "that the slaves were liberated by the interference of the colonial authorities," that these "not only gave no aid, but did actually interfere to set free the slaves, and to enable them to disperse themselves beyond the reach of the master of the vessel or their owners." This statement is taken from the protest of the captain and crew, made at New-Orleans, which indeed uses much stronger language, and which charges on the British authorities much more exceptionable interference. This, as I have said, is to be suspected of exaggeration or unjust colouring, not on the ground of any peculiar falseness in the men who signed it, but because of the tendency of passion and interest to misconstrue the offensive conduct of others. But admitting the correctness of the protest, we cannot attach importance to the complaint of the Document. This insists that the English authorities "interfered to set free the slaves." I reply that the authorities did not and could not set the coloured men free, and for the plain reason,

that they were in no sense slaves in the British port. The authorities found them in the first instance both legally and actually free. How, then, could they be liberated? They stood before the magistrates free at the first moment. They had passed beyond the legislation of the State which had imposed their chains. They had come under a jurisdiction which knew nothing of property in man, nothing of the relation of master and slave. As soon as they entered the British waters, the legal power of the captain over them, whatever it might have been, ceased. They were virtually "beyond his reach," even whilst on board. Of course no act of the authorities was needed for their liberation.

But this is not all. The coloured men were not only legally free on entering the British port; they were so actually and as a matter of fact. The British authorities had not the merit of exerting the least physical power to secure to them their right to liberty. The slaves had liberated themselves. They had imprisoned the captain. They had taken the command of the vessel. The British authorities interfered, to liberate not the coloured people but the captain; not to uphold but arrest "the mutineers." Their action was friendly to the officers and crew. In all this action however they did nothing of course to reduce the slaves a second time to bondage. Had they, in restoring the vessel to the captain, replaced directly or indirectly the liberated slaves under the yoke, they would have done so at their peril. How, then, could they free those men whom they knew only as free? They simply declared them free—declared a matter of fact which could not be gainsaid. If they persuaded them to leave the ship,

they plainly acted in this as counsellors and friends, and exerted no official power.

It is said, indeed, in the protest, that the magistrates "commanded" the slaves to go on shore. If this be true, and if the command were accompanied with any force, they indeed committed a wrong; but one, I fear, for which our government will be slow to seek redress. They wronged the liberated slaves. These were free, and owed no obedience to such a command. They had a right to stay where they were, a right to return to America; and in being compelled to go on shore, they received an injury, for which our government, if so disposed, may make complaint. But the slaves alone were the injured party. The right of the owner was not violated, for he had no right. His claim was a nullity in the British port. He was not known there. The law on which he stood in his own country was there a dead letter. Who can found on it a complaint against the British government?

It is said that the "comity of nations" forbade this interference. But this comity is a vague unsettled law, and ought not to come into competition with the obligations of a State to injured men, thrown on its protection, and whose lives and liberties are at stake.* We must wait, however, for farther light from Nassau, to comprehend the whole case. It is not impossible that the authorities at that port exerted an undue influence, and took on themselves an undue responsibility. Among the liberated slaves, there were undoubtedly not a few so ignorant and helpless, as to be poorly fitted to seek their fortune in the West Indies, among strangers little disposed to sympathise with their sufferings or aid

* See Note B.

their inexperience. These ought to have been assured of their liberty; but they should have been left to follow without any kind of resistance, their shrinking from an unknown shore, and their desire to return to the land of their birth, whenever these feelings were expressed.

I know not that I have overlooked any of the considerations which are urged in the Executive Document in support of our complaints against Great Britain in the case of the Creole. I have laboured to understand and meet their full force. I am sorry to have been obliged to enter into these so minutely and to repeat what I deem true principles so often. But the necessity was laid on me. The Document does not lay down explicitly any great principle with which our claim must stand or fall. Its strength lies in the skilful suggestion of various circumstances which strike the common reader, and which must successively be examined to show their insufficiency to the end for which they are adduced. It is possible, however, to give something of a general form to the opinions expressed in it, and to detect under these a general principle. This I shall proceed to do as necessary to the full comprehension of this paper. The opinions scattered through the Document may be thus expressed:—"Slaves pronounced to be property by American law, and shipped as such, ought to be so regarded by a foreign government on whose shores they may be thrown. This government is bound to regard the national stamp set on them. It has no right to inquire into the condition of these persons. It cannot give to them the character or privileges of the country to which they are carried. Suppose a government to have declared opium a thing

in which no property can lawfully exist or be asserted, would it therefore have a right to take the character of property from opium, when driven in a foreign ship into its ports, and to cast it into the sea? Certainly not. Neither, because it declares that men cannot be property, can it take this character from slaves, when they are driven into its ports from a country which makes them property by its laws. They still belong to the distant claimant; his right must not be questioned or disturbed; and he must be aided in holding them in bondage, if his power over them is endangered by distress or mutiny." Such are the opinions of the Document in a condensed form, and they involve one great principle, namely this, that property is an arbitrary thing, created by governments; that a government may make anything property at its will; and that what its subjects or citizens hold as property under this sanction, must be regarded as such without inquiry by the civilised world. According to the Document, a nation may attach the character of property to whatever it pleases; may attach it alike to men and women, beef and pork, cotton and rice; and other nations, into whose ports its vessels may pass, are bound to respect its laws in these particulars, and, in case of distress, to assist in enforcing them. Let our country, through its established government, declare our fathers or mothers, sons or daughters, to be property; and they become such, and the right of the master must not be questioned at home or abroad.

Now, this doctrine, stated in plain language, needs no laboured refutation; it is disproved by the immediate testimony of conscience and common sense. Property is not an arbitrary thing, dependent wholly on man's

will. It has its foundation and great laws in nature, and these cannot be violated without crime. It is plainly the intention of Providence, that certain things should be owned, should be held as property. They fulfil their end only by such appropriation. The material world was plainly made to be subjected to human labour, and its products to be moulded by skill to human use. He who wins them by honest toil has a right to them, and is wronged when others seize and consume them. The Document supposes a government to declare, that opium is an article in which property cannot exist or be asserted, and, on this ground, to wrest it from the owner and throw it into the sea; and this it considers as a parallel case to the declaration, that property in man cannot exist. But who does not see that the parallel is absurd? The poppy, which contains the opium, is by its nature fitted and designed to be held as property. The man who rears it by his capital, industry, and skill, thus establishes a right to it, and is injured if it be torn from him, except in the special case where some higher right supersedes that of property. The poppy is not wronged by being owned and consumed. It has no intelligence, no conscience for its own direction; no destiny to fulfil by the wise use and culture of its powers. It has therefore no Rights. By being appropriated to an individual it does good, it suffers no wrong.

Here are the grounds of property. They are found in the nature of the articles so used; and where these grounds are wholly wanting, as in the case of human beings, it cannot exist or be asserted. A man was made to be an owner, not to be owned; to acquire, not to become property. He has faculties for the government of

himself. He has a great destiny. He sustains tender and sacred relations, especially those of parent and husband, and with the duties and blessings of these no one must interfere. As such a being he has Rights. These belong to his very nature. They belong to every one who partakes it; all here are equal. He therefore may be wronged, and is most grievously wronged, when forcibly seized by a fellow-creature, who has no other nature and rights than his own, and seized by such a one to live for his pleasure, to be bowed to his absolute will, to be placed under his lash, to be sold, driven from home, and torn from parent, wife, and child for another's gain. Does any parallel exist between such a being and opium? Can we help seeing a distinction between the nature of a plant and a man, which forbids their being confounded under the same character of property? Is not the distinction recognised by us in the administration of our laws? When a man from the South brings hither his watch and trunk, is his right to them deemed a whit the less sacred, because the laws of his State cease to protect them? Do we not recognise them as his, as intuitively and cheerfully as if they belonged to a citizen of our own State? Are they not his, here and everywhere? Do we not feel that he would be wronged, were they torn from him? But when he brings a slave, we do not recognise his property in our fellow-creature; we pronounce the slave free. Whose reason and conscience do not intuitively pronounce this distinction between a man and a watch to be just?

It may be urged, however, that this is a distinction for moralists, not for governments; that if a government establishes property, however unjustly, in human

beings, this is its own concern, and the concern of no other; and that articles on board its vessels must be recognised by other nations as what it declares them to be, without any question as to the morality or fitness of its measures. One nation, we are told, is not to interfere with another. I need not repeat, in reply, what I have so often said, that a government has solemn duties towards every human being entering its ports—duties which no local law about property in another country can in any degree impair. I would only say, that a government is not bound in all possible cases to respect the stamp put by another government on articles transported in the vessels of the latter. The comity of nations supposes, that in all such transactions, respect is paid to common sense and common justice. Suppose a government to declare cotton to be horses, to write "horse" on all the bales within its limits, and to set these down as horses in its custom-house papers; and suppose a cargo of these to enter a port where the importation of cotton is forbidden. Will the comity of nations forbid the foreign nation to question the character which has been affixed by law to the bales in the country to which they belong? Can a law change the nature of things in the intercourse of nations? Must officers be stone-blind through "comity?" Would it avail anything to say, that by an old domestic institution in the exporting country, cotton was pronounced horse, and that such institution must not be interfered with by foreigners? Now, in the estimation of England, and of sound morality, it is as hard to turn man into property as horses into cotton, and this estimation England has embodied in its laws. Can we expect such a country to reverence the stamp of property on men, because attached to them by a foreign land?

The Executive Document not only maintains the obligation of the English authorities to respect what the South had stamped on the slave, but maintains earnestly that "the English authorities had no right to *inquire* into the cargo of the vessel, or the condition of persons on board." Now it is unnecessary to dispute about this right; for the British authorities did not exercise it, did not need it. The truth of the case, and the whole truth, they could not help seeing, even had they wished to remain blind. Master, crew, passengers, coloured people, declared with one voice that the latter were shipped as slaves. Their character was thus forced on the government, which of course had no liberty of action in the case. By the laws of England, slavery could not be recognised within its jurisdiction. No human being could be recognised as property. The authorities had but one question to ask: Are these poor creatures men? and to solve this question no right of search was needed. It solved itself. A single glance settled the point. Of course we have no ground to complain of a busy intermeddling with cargo and persons, to determine their character by British authorities.

I have thus finished my examination of the Document, and shall conclude with some general remarks. And first, I cannot but express my sorrow at the tone of Inhumanity which pervades it. I have said at the beginning that I should make no personal strictures; and I have no thought of charging on our Cabinet any singular want of human feeling. The Document bears witness not to individual hardness of heart, but to the callousness, the cruel insensibility, which has seized the community at large. Our contact with slavery has seared in a measure almost all hearts. Were there a

healthy tone of feeling among us, certain passages in this Document would call forth a burst of displeasure. For example, what an outrage is offered to humanity, in instituting a comparison between man and opium, in treating these as having equal rights and equal sanctity, in degrading an immortal child of God to the level of a drug, in placing both equally at the mercy of selfish legislators! To an unsophisticated man there is not only inhumanity but irreligion, in thus treating a being made in the image of God and infinitely dear to the Universal Father.

In the same tone, the slaves who regained their freedom by a struggle which cost the life of a white man, and by which one of their own number perished, are set down as "mutineers and murderers." Be it granted that their violence is condemned by the Christian law. Be it granted that the assertion of our rights must not be stained with cruelty; that it is better for us to die slaves, than to inflict death on our oppressor. But is there a man, having a manly spirit, who can withhold all sympathy and admiration from men, who, having grown up under the blighting influence of slavery, yet had the courage to put life to hazard for liberty? Are freemen slow to comprehend and honour the impulse, which stirs men to break an unjust and degrading chain? Would the laws of any free State pronounce the taking of life in such a case "murder?" Because a man, under coercion, whilst on his way to a new yoke, and in the act of being carried by force from wife and children and home, sheds blood to escape his oppressor, is he to be confounded with the vilest criminals? Does a republic, whose heroic age was the Revolution of 1776, and whose illustrious men earned their glory in a

sanguinary conflict for rights, find no mitigation of this bloodshed, in the greater wrongs to which the slave is subjected? This letter would have lost nothing of its force, it would at least have shown better taste, had it consulted humanity enough to be silent about "opium" and "murder."

I cannot refrain from another view of the Document. This declaration of national principles cannot be too much lamented and disapproved, for the dishonour it has brought on our country. It openly arrays us as a people against the cause of human freedom. It throws us in the way of the progress of liberal principles through the earth. The grand distinction of our revolution was, that it not only secured the independence of a single nation, but asserted the rights of mankind. It gave to the spirit of freedom an impulse, which, notwithstanding the dishonour cast on the cause by the excesses of France, is still acting deeply and broadly on the civilised world. Since that period, a new consciousness of what is due to a human being has been working its way. It has penetrated into despotic States. Even in countries, where the individual has no constitutional means of controlling government, personal liberty has a sacredness and protection never known before. Among the triumphs of this spirit of freedom and humanity, one of the most signal is the desire to put an end to slavery. The cry for Emancipation swells and spreads from land to land. And whence comes the opposing cry? From St. Petersburg? From Constantinople? From the gloomy jealous cabinets of despotism? No; but from republican America! from that country, whose Declaration of Independence was an era in human history! The

nations of the earth are beginning to proclaim, that slaves shall not breathe their air, that whoever touches their soil shall be free. Republican America protests against this reverence for right and humanity, and summons the nations to enforce her laws against the slave. Oh my country! hailed once as the asylum of the oppressed, once consecrated to liberty, once a name pronounced with tears of joy and hope! now a by-word among the nations, the scorn of the very subjects of despotism! How art thou fallen, morning star of freedom! And has it come to this? Must thy children blush to pronounce thy name? Must we cower in the presence of the Christian world? Must we be degraded to the lowest place among Christian nations? Is the sword, which wrought out our liberties, to be unsheathed now to enforce the claims of slavery on foreign States? Can we bear this burning shame? Are the Free States prepared to incur this infamy and crime?

"Slaves cannot breathe in England." I learned this line when I was a boy, and in imagination I took flight to the soil which could never be tainted by slaves. Through the spirit which spoke in that line, England has decreed that slaves cannot breathe in her islands. Ought we not to rejoice in this new conquest of humanity? Ought not the tidings of it to have been received with beaming eyes and beating hearts? Instead of this, we demand that Humanity shall retrace her steps, and Liberty resign her trophies. We call on a great nation to abandon its solemnly pronounced conviction of duty, its solemnly pledged respect for human rights, and to do what it believes to be unjust, inhuman, and base. Is there nothing of insult in such a demand? This case is no common one. It is not a question of

policy, not an ordinary diplomatic concern. A whole people, from no thought of policy, but planting itself on the ground of justice and of Christianity, sweeps slavery from its soil, and declares that no slave shall tread there. This profound religious conviction, in which all Christian nations are joining her, we come in conflict with openly and without shame. Is this an enviable position for a country which would respect itself or be respected by the world? It is idle, and worse than idle, to say, as is sometimes said, that England has no motive but policy in her movements about slavery. He who says so, talks ignorantly or recklessly. I have studied abolitionism in England enough to assure those who have neglected it, that it was the act not of the politician but of the people. In this respect it stands alone in history. It was a disinterested movement of a Christian nation in behalf of oppressed strangers, beginning with Christians, carried through by Christians. The government resisted it for years. The government was compelled to yield to the voice of the people. No act of the English nation was ever so national, so truly the people's act, as this. And can we hope to conquer the conscience as well as the now solemnly adopted policy of a great nation? Were England to concede this point, she would prove herself false to known, acknowledged truth and duty. Her freshest, proudest laurel would wither. The toils and prayers of her Wilberforces, Clarksons, and a host of holy men, which now invoke God's blessings on her, would be turned to her reproach and shame, and call down the vengeance of Heaven.

In bearing this testimony to the spirit of the English people in the abolition of the slave trade and of slavery,

nothing is farther from my mind than a disposition to defend the public policy or institutions of that country. In this case, as in most others, the people are better than their rulers. England is one of the last countries of which I am ready to become a partisan. There must be something radically wrong in the policy, institutions, and spirit of a nation, which all other nations regard with jealousy and dislike. Great Britain, with all her progress in the arts, has not learned the art of inspiring confidence and love. She sends forth her bounty over the earth, but, politically considered, has made the world her foe. Her Chinese war, and her wild extension of dominion over vast regions which she cannot rule well or retain, give reason to fear, that she is falling a prey to the disease under which great nations have so often perished.

To a man who looks with sympathy and brotherly regard on the mass of the people, who is chiefly interested in the "lower classes," England must present much which is repulsive. Though a monarchy in name, she is an aristocracy in fact; and an aristocratical caste, however adorned by private virtue, can hardly help sinking an infinite chasm between itself and the multitude of men. A privileged order, possessing the chief power of the State, cannot but rule in the spirit of an order, cannot respect the mass of the people, cannot feel that for *them* government chiefly exists and ought to be administered, and that for *them* the nobleman holds his rank as a trust. The condition of the lower orders at the present moment is a mournful commentary on English institutions and civilization. The multitude are depressed in that country to a degree of ignorance, want, and misery, which must touch every heart not

made of stone. In the civilised world there are few sadder spectacles, than the contrast, now presented in Great Britain, of unbounded wealth and luxury with the starvation of thousands and ten thousands, crowded into cellars and dens without ventilation or light, compared with which the wigwam of the Indian is á palace. Misery, famine, brutal degradation, in the neighbourhood and presence of stately mansions, which ring with gaiety and dazzle with pomp and unbounded profusion, shock us as no other wretchedness does; and this is not an accidental but an almost necessary effect of the spirit of aristocracy and the spirit of trade acting intensely together. It is a striking fact, that the private charity of England, though almost incredible, makes little impression on this mass of misery, thus teaching the rich and titled to be "just before being generous," and not to look to private munificence, as a remedy for the evils of selfish institutions.

Notwithstanding my admiration of the course of England in reference to slavery, I see as plainly as any the wrongs and miseries under which her lower classes groan. I do not on this account, however, subscribe to a doctrine very common in this country, that the poor Chartists of England are more to be pitied than our slaves. Ah no. Misery is not slavery, and, were it greater than it is, would afford the slave-holder no warrant for trampling on the rights and the souls of his fellow-creatures. The Chartist, depressed as he is, is not a slave. The blood would rush to his cheek and the spirit of a man swell his emaciated form, at the suggestion of relieving his misery by reducing him to bondage; and this sensibility shows the immeasurable distance between him and the slave. He has rights

and knows them. He pleads his own cause, and just and good men plead it for him. According to the best testimony, intelligence is spreading among the Chartists; so is temperance; so is self-restraint. They feel themselves to be men. Their wives and children do not belong to another. They meet together for free discussion, and their speeches are not wanting in strong sense and strong expression. Not a few among them have seized on the idea of the elevation of their class by a new intellectual and moral culture, and here is a living seed, the promise of immeasurable good. Shall such men, who aspire after a better lot, and among whom strong and generous spirits are springing up, be confounded with slaves, whose lot admits no change, who must not speak of wrongs or think of redress, whom it is a crime to teach to read, to whom even the Bible is a sealed book, who have no future, no hope on this side death.

I have spoken freely of England; yet I do not forget our debt or the debt of the world to her. She was the mother of our freedom. She has been the bulwark of Protestantism. What nation has been more fruitful in great men, in men of genius? What nation can compare with her in munificence? What nation but must now acknowledge her unrivalled greatness? That little island sways a wider empire than the Roman, and has a power of blessing mankind never before conferred on a people. Would to God she could learn, what nation never yet learned, so to use power, as to inspire confidence not fear, so as to awaken a world's gratitude not its jealousy and revenge!

But whatever be the claims of England or of any other State, I must cling to my own country with strong

preference, and cling to it even now, in this dark day, this day of her humiliation, when she stands before the world branded, beyond the truth, with dishonesty, and, too truly, with the crime of resisting the progress of freedom on the earth. After all she has her glory. After all, in these Free States, a man is still a man. He knows his rights, he respects himself, and acknowledges the equal claim of his brother. We have order without the display of force. We have government without soldiers, spies, or the constant presence of coercion. The rights of thought, of speech, of the press, of conscience, of worship, are enjoyed to the full without violence or dangerous excess. We are even distinguished by kindliness and good temper amidst this unbounded freedom. The individual is not lost in the mass, but has a consciousness of self-subsistence, and stands erect. That character which we call Manliness, is stamped on the multitude here as nowhere else. No aristocracy interferes with the natural relations of men to one another. No hierarchy weighs down the intellect, and makes the church a prison to the soul from which it ought to break every chain. I make no boast of my country's progress, marvellous as it has been. I feel deeply her defects. But in the language of Cowper, I can say to her,

> "Yet being free I love thee; for the sake
> Of that one feature can be well content,
> Disgraced as thou hast been, poor as thou art,
> To seek no sublunary rest beside."

Our country is free; this is its glory. How deeply to be lamented is it, that this glory is obscured by the presence of slavery in any part of our territory. The distant foreigner, to whom America is a point, and who

communicates the taint of a part to the whole, hears with derision our boast of liberty, and points with a sneer to our ministers in London not ashamed to plead the rights of slavery before the civilised world. He ought to learn, that America, which shrinks in his mind into a narrow unity, is a league of sovereignties, stretching from the Bay of Fundy to the Gulf of Mexico, and destined, unless disunited, to spread from ocean to ocean; that a great majority of its citizens hold no slaves; that a vast proportion of its wealth, commerce, manufactures, and arts, belongs to the wide region not blighted by this evil; that we of the Free States cannot touch slavery, where it exists, with one of our fingers; that it exists without and against our will; and that our necessity is not our choice and crime.* Still the cloud hangs over us as a people, the only dark and menacing cloud. Can it not be dispersed? Will not the South, so alive to honour, so ardent and fearless, and containing so many elements of greatness, resolve on the destruction of what does not profit and cannot but degrade it? Must slavery still continue to exist, a firebrand at home and our shame abroad? Can we of the Free States brook, that it should be thrust perpetually by our diplomacy on the notice of a reproving world? that it should become our distinction among the nations? that it should place us behind all? Can we endure, that it should control our public counsels, that it should threaten war, should threaten to assert its claims in the thunder of our artillery? Can we endure that our peace should be broken, our country exposed to invasion, our cities stormed, our fields ravaged, our prosperity withered, our progress arrested, our sons

* See Note C.

slain, our homes turned into deserts, not for rights, not for liberty, not for a cause which humanity smiles on and God will bless, but to rivet chains on fellow-creatures, to extend the law of slavery throughout the earth? These are great questions for the Free States. I must defer the answer of them to another time. The duties of the Free States in relation to slavery deserve the most serious regard. Let us implore Him, who was the God of our fathers, and who has shielded us in so many perils, to open our minds and hearts to what is true and just and good, to continue our union at home and our peace abroad, and to make our country a living witness to the blessings of freedom, of Reverence for Right on our own shores and in our intercourse with all nations.

NOTES.

A.

To the preceding remarks, it is in vain to oppose the "comity of nations." England in her public acts having pronounced slavery unjust, pronounces also, that "comity" cannot prevail against justice. And is not this right and true? Can a nation be bound by comity to recognise within its borders and to carry into effect, by its judicial or executive machinery, the laws of another country which it holds to be violations of the law of nature or of God? Would not our own courts indignantly refuse to enforce a contract or relation between foreigners here, which, however valid in their own land where it was made, was contrary to our own institutions or to the acknowledged precepts of morality and religion?

B.

"It is said, that this alleged interference by the British authorities was contrary to the comity of nations, and that therefore the British government is bound to indemnify the owners of the slaves? But indemnity for what? for their asserted property in these men? But that government does not recognise property in men. Suppose the slaves were dispersed by reason of its interference; yet the master and owners received no damage thereby, for they had no title to the slaves. Their property had ceased, when these men came under the benign influence of English law."

C.

I have spoken of the great majority in our country who have no participation whatever in slavery. Indeed it is little suspected at home any more than abroad, how small is the number of slave-holders here. I learn from a judicious correspondent at the South, that the slave-holders in that region cannot be rated at more than

300,000. Some make them less. Supposing each of them to be the head of a family, and each family to consist of five members; then there will be 1,500,000 having a direct interest in slaves as property. This is about *one-eleventh* of the population of the United States. The 300,000 actual slave-holders are about a *fifty-sixth part* of our whole population. These govern the South entirely, *by acting* in concert, and by the confinement of the best education to their ranks; and, still more, to a considerable extent, they have governed the whole country. Their cry rises above all other sounds in the land. Few as they are, their voices well-nigh drown the quiet reasonings and remonstrances of the North in the House of Representatives.

THE

DUTY OF THE FREE STATES.

SECOND PART.

THE

DUTY OF THE FREE STATES.

THE first part of this Tract was devoted to an examination of the affair of the Creole. Its object, however, as the reader may easily discern, was not so much to determine the merits of a particular case, as to set forth general principles of justice and humanity, which have been too much overlooked in the intercourse of individuals and nations. I shall keep the same object in view in this second part of my remarks, which will have no reference to the Creole, but be devoted to the consideration of the Duties of the Free States. My great aim, in what I have written and now write, on matters of public interest, is to re-unite politics and morality; to bring into harmony the law of the land and the law of God. Among the chief causes of the miseries of nations is the divorce which has taken place between politics and morality; nor can we hope for a better day till this breach be healed. Men, entrusted with government, have always been disposed to regard themselves as absolved from the laws of justice and humanity. Falsehoods and frauds are allowed them for their country or their party. To maintain themselves against their opponents, they may

even involve nations in war; and the murders and robberies which follow this crime are not visited on their heads by human justice. In all times, government has been the grand robber, the grand murderer, and has yet escaped the deep reprobation which breaks forth against private guilt. Such profligacy pervades the sphere of political action, that the confidence of the people is well-nigh withdrawn from public men; and a virtuous statesman is involved in the suspicions which his unprincipled associates have drawn upon his vocation. Public life is thought to release men not only from the obligations of justice, but from the restraints of good manners; and accordingly the debates of Congress are too often polluted by vulgar abuse, threats, and brawls. So low is the standard of political life, that a man is smiled at for his simplicity, who talks of introducing religion into the conduct of public affairs. Religion, it is thought, belongs to sabbaths and churches, and would be as much out of place in cabinets or halls of legislation, as a delicate lady on a field of battle. A stranger might be tempted to think that the sergeant-at-arms was stationed at the doors of legislative chambers, to forbid entrance to the everlasting law of God, and that nothing but man's impotence prevents the exclusion of Him whose holy presence fills the universe.

Nothing is so needed as to revive in citizens and rulers, the conviction of the supremacy of the moral Christian law. Could this be done, the earth would cease to be what in a measure it now is, the image of hell, and would begin to grow green again with the plants of paradise. Religion, the only true guide of life, the guardian and inspirer of all the virtues, should

especially reign over the deliberations of governments, by which the weal and woe of nations, the solemn questions of peace and war, of life and death are determined. On this account, every man who has studied human duty, human perfection, human happiness, has a right and is bound to speak on matters of public concern, though his judgment may be contemned by hackneyed politicians. It seems, indeed, to be thought by some, that politics are mysteries, which only the initiated must deal with. But in this country, they belong to the people. Public questions are and ought to be subjected to the moral judgment of the community. They ought to be referred to the religion which we profess. Christianity was meant to be brought into actual life. The high and the low, private and public men, are alike to bow before it. To remove any sphere of human action from its cognizance, is virtually to deny its divinity, and to absolve all men from its control. Under these impressions, I shall speak of the Duties of the Free States. Duties rank higher than interests, and deserve the first regard. It is my particular object to consider the obligations of the Free States in regard to slavery; but I shall not stop at these. Other obligations need to be pressed. It is not, indeed, easy to confine one's self within rigid bounds, when the subject of duty is discussed; and, accordingly, I shall add remarks on a few topics, not intimately connected with slavery, though in truth this subject will be found to insinuate itself into all.

I am to speak of the duty of the Free States; but it is important to observe, that I mean by these, not merely communities represented in legislatures, but much more, the individuals, the people, who compose them.

I shall speak not of what we are bound to do as sovereignties, but as men, as Christians. I shall speak not merely of the action of Government, but of the influence which every man is bound to exert in the sphere in which Providence has placed him; of the obligations of the individual to bring public opinion and public affairs, as far as he may, to the standard of truth and rectitude.

I insist on this, because the feeling of individual responsibility is very much lost in consequence of the excessive deference of the private man to the government under which he lives. On the subject of slavery in particular, the responsibility both at the North and South is shifted very much from the individual to the State. The private conscience is merged in the public. What the Government determines the multitude of men are apt to think right. We do not exercise our moral judgment, because it has been forestalled by the constitution and by the laws. We are members of a community, and this relation triumphs over all others.

Now, the truth is, that no decision of the State absolves us from the moral law, from the authority of conscience. It is no excuse for our wrong-doing, that the artificial organization, called society, has done wrong. It is of the highest moment, that the prevalent notions of a man's relation to the State should be rectified. The idea of this relation is so exaggerated and perverted, as to impair the force of every other. A man's country is more thought of than his nature. His connection with a particular community is more respected than his connection with God. His alliance with his race is reduced to a nullity by his alliance with the State. He must be ready to give up his race, to

sacrifice all its rights and interests, that the little spot where he was born may triumph or prosper. The history of nations is very much the history of the immolation of the individual to the country. His nationality stands out before all his other attributes. The nation, represented by one or a few individuals, has arrogated to itself the dignity of being the fountain of all his rights. It has made his religion for him. Its will, called law, has taken place of all other laws. It has seized on the individual as its tool, and doomed him to live and die for its most selfish purposes. The sacredness of the individual is even yet so little understood, that the freest country on earth is talking of war, because a local law, enslaving the individual, is not recognised by the whole earth. But the nation is not everything. The nation is not the fountain of right. Our first duties are not to our country. Our first allegiance is not due to its laws. We belong first to God, and next to our race. We were, indeed, made for partial, domestic, and national ties and affections, and these are essential means of our education and happiness in this first stage of our being; but all these are to be kept in subjection to the laws of universal justice and humanity. They are intended to train us up to these. In these consists our likeness to the Divinity. From these considerations it will be seen that the following remarks are not addressed to bodies politic, so much as to individuals.

The duty of the Free States in regard to slavery may be classed under two heads. First: these States are bound to construe with the utmost strictness all the articles of the Constitution which in any way touch on slavery, so that they may do nothing in aid of this in-

stitution, but what is undeniably demanded by that instrument; and secondly, they are bound to seek earnestly such amendments of the Constitution as will remove this subject wholly from the cognizance of the general government; such as will be just alike to the North and South; such as will release the North from all obligation whatever to support or sanction slavery, and as will insure the South from all attempts by the Free States to stir up the slaves.

First: the Free States are bound to confine all action in regard to slavery to the narrowest limits which will satisfy the Constitution. Under this head, our attention is naturally drawn, first to the chief, and I may say, the only express provision of the instrument relating to this subject. I refer to the clause requiring that the slave escaping into the Free States shall be delivered up on the claim of his master. This provision may seem clear; but the execution of it in such a manner as to accomplish its end, and yet to prevent the encroachments of slavery on the Free States, is not easy. The provision was designed to give authority to the master to claim the fugitive slave. But in doing this, a far higher good than the recovery of a thousand slaves flying from the South is put in peril, and that is, the freedom of the coloured population of the North; and we are bound to insist that this freedom shall be placed beyond the reach of peril. This danger is not imaginary. Kidnapping in the Free States is one of the evils which have grown out of our connection with slavery, and it has been carried on with circumstances of great barbarity. Thus slavery has been recruited from the North.

The law of Congress, framed to carry into effect

the constitutional provision to which we have referred, almost seems to have been designed to give shelter to this crime. No care has been taken to shield the coloured man at the North. The slave-holder or slave-hunter may carry him before a justice of the peace as a fugitive, and may himself be a witness in the case, and this tribunal may send the accused to perpetual bondage. We all know how, and by whom a commission of justice of peace is often obtained. We know that a claim of more than twenty dollars is not left to the decision of a justice's court. We know the advantage which may be enjoyed before such a magistrate, by the rich slave-holder over a poor, perhaps friendless labourer. And yet to this tribunal it is given to pass a sentence on a human being as terrible as death. An officer, not trusted with the adjudication of property exceeding twenty dollars, is allowed to make a man a slave for life.

To repair this great injustice, to prevent the transportation of our citizens to slavery, some of the state legislatures have held themselves bound to supply the deficiencies of the law of Congress, and for this end have referred the suspected slave to a higher tribunal, and given him the benefit of trial by jury. To our great sorrow, this state legislation has been pronounced unconstitutional by a recent decree of the Supreme Court of the United States; so that the coloured man is driven back to the court to which he had been unjustly doomed before. On this decree it becomes me not to pass sentence; but one thing is clear, that the Free States are now bound to the most earnest efforts to protect that portion of their citizens exposed to the peril of being carried into bondage.

The grand principle to be laid down is, that it is infinitely more important to preserve a free citizen from being made a slave, than to send back a fugitive slave to his chain. This idea is to rule over and determine all the legislation on this subject. Let the fugitive be delivered up, but by such processes as will prevent a freeman from being delivered up also. For this end full provision must be made. On this point the Constitution, and a still higher law, that of nature and God, speak the same language; and we must insist that these high authorities shall be revered.

The Constitution opens with these memorable words: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure *the blessings of liberty* to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." It is understood and conceded, that this preamble does not confer on the national government any powers but such as are specified in the subsequent articles of the instrument; but it teaches and was designed to teach the spirit in which these powers are to be interpreted and brought into action. "To secure the blessings of liberty," is enumerated among the purposes of the national compact; and whoever knows the history of the Constitution, knows that this was the grand purpose for which the powers of the Constitution were conferred. That the liberty of each man, of the obscurest man, should be inviolate; this was the master-thought in the authors of this immortal charter. According to these views, we have a right to demand of Congress, as their highest constitutional duty, to carry into the enactment

of every law a reverence for the freedom of each and all. A law palpably exposing the freeman to be made a slave, and even rendering his subjection to this cruel doom nearly sure, is one of the most unconstitutional acts, if the spirit of the Constitution be regarded, which the national legislature can commit. The Constitution is violated, not only by the assumption of powers not conceded, but equally by using conceded powers to the frustration of the end for which they were conferred. In the law regulating the delivery of supposed fugitives, the great end of the national charter is sacrificed to an accidental provision. This Constitution was not established to send back slaves to chains. The article requiring this act of the Free States was forced on them by the circumstances of the times, and submitted to as a hard necessity. It did not enter into the essence of the instrument; whilst the security of freedom was its great, living, all-pervading idea. We see the tendency of slavery to warp the Constitution to its purposes, in the law for restoring the flying bondman. Under this not a few, having not only the same natural but legal rights with ourselves, have been subjected to the lash of the overseer.

But a higher law than the Constitution protests against the act of Congress on this point. According to the law of nature, no greater crime against a human being can be committed, than to make him a slave. This is to strike a blow at the very heart and centre of all his rights as a man; to put him beneath his race. On the ground of the immutable law of nature, our government has pronounced the act of making a man a slave on the coast of Africa, to be piracy, a capital crime. And shall the same government enact or sus-

tain a law which exposes the freeman here to be reduced to slavery, which gives facilities to the unprincipled for accomplishing this infinite wrong? And what is the end for which the freeman is so exposed? It is that a man flying from an unjust yoke may be forced back to bondage, an end against which natural and divine justice protests; so that to confirm and perpetuate one violation of the moral law, another still greater is left open and made easy to the kidnapper.

There seems no need of enlarging on this point. Every man who enjoys liberty can understand what it is to be made a slave, to be held and treated as property, to be subjected to arbitrary will, to arbitrary punishment, to the loss of wife and child, at another's pleasure. Every man knows what he would feel at having a son or a daughter torn from him and sent to slavery. And liberty is not a whit dearer to us than it is to a human brother, whose only misfortune it is to wear a darker skin. We are bound to extend to him the same protection of law as to our own child.

To condemn a man to perpetual slavery is as solemn a sentence as to condemn him to death. Before being thus doomed, he has a right to all the means of defence which are granted to a man who is tried for his life. All the rules, forms, solemnities, by which innocence is secured from being confounded with guilt, he has a right to demand. In the present case, the principle is eminently applicable, that many guilty should escape, rather than that one innocent man should suffer; because the guilt of running away from an "owner," is of too faint a colour to be seen by some of the best eyes, whilst that of enslaving the free is of the darkest hue.

The Constitution provides that no man shall "be

deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." A man delivered up as a slave is deprived of all property, all liberty, and placed in a condition where life and limb are held at another's pleasure. Does he enjoy the benefits of a "due process of law," when a common justice of peace, selected by the master, and receiving the master as a witness, passes sentence on him without jury and without appeal?

It is of great importance, that a new and satisfactory law on this subject should be passed by Congress. It is a serious evil to perpetuate legislation against which the moral sense of the community protests. In this country, public opinion is the strength of the laws, is the grand force with which the public authorities must surround themselves. The present law for the recovery of fugitive slaves is reprobated, not by the passions, but by the deliberate moral judgments of large portions of the Free States; and such being the case, it cannot be executed. There are a thousand ways of evading it without force. In some parts of the country, I fear, it might be resisted by force, should its execution be urged; and although a law demanded by justice should never be yielded to the fear of tumult; though we ought to encounter violence rather than make a sacrifice of duty; yet, on the other hand, it is most unwise to uphold a palpably unrighteous law, which by its unrighteousness endangers the public peace. In such a case, the chief responsibility for the danger rests on the obstinacy of the legislator. The appointed guardian of social order proves its foe.

A trial by jury ought to be granted to the suspected fugitive, as being the most effectual provision for innocence known to our laws. It is said, that under such a

process, the slave will not be restored to his master. Undoubtedly the jury is an imperfect tribunal, and may often fail of a wise and just administration of the laws. But, as we have seen, the first question to be asked is, How shall the free man be preserved from being sentenced to slavery? This is an infinitely greater evil than the escape of the fugitive; and to avert this, a trial by jury should be granted, unless some other process as safe and effectual can be devised.

In these remarks, I would not intimate that the slaveholders as a body desire a loose law, which will place the innocent at their mercy, in order to be kidnappers. The South is as incapable of this baseness as the North. But in both regions there are too many men, profligate enough to use such a law for the perpetration of the greatest crime. We know that the existing law has been so used, that the facilities and temptations, which it ministers to the grossest violation of right, have whetted cupidity and instigated to cruelty. Then it must be changed.

The slaveholder must not say that a change will annul his claim on the flying slave. He ought to consider that in insisting on processes for enforcing his claim, which cannot but result in enslaving the free, he virtually enrols himself among kidnappers. Still more, he should understand that his only chance of asserting his claim rests on the establishment of such a law as will secure the rights of the coloured man of the Free States. There is a jealousy on this point among us, which, as it is righteous, must be respected. It is a spreading jealousy, and will obstruct, more and more, the operation of the existing law. It must not be spoken of as a fever which has reached its height. It is a sign

of returning moral health, and its progress will be aided by perseverance in immoral means of reclaiming the flying slave.

Having shown how the Free States are bound to construe the clause of the Constitution relating to fugitive slaves, or rather, "persons held to service in other States," I proceed, in the second place, to show the strict construction which should be given to those parts of the Constitution under which the general government has been led to take slavery into its protection, *in its intercourse with foreign nations.* This agency is believed to be wholly without warrant, and it threatens so to extend itself, and to disturb so much our relations with foreign states, that we are bound, not only by considerations of morality, but of our essential interests, to reduce it within the precise limits of the Constitution.

By this instrument, the powers of declaring war, appointing ambassadors, raising armies, and making treaties, are conferred on the national government. The protection of our rights against foreign powers was undoubtedly a principal end of the Union. Every part of the country expects and requires it "to provide for the common defence." But it is plain that this duty of the national government, to watch over our rights abroad, cannot go beyond those rights. It cannot seek redress but for wrongs inflicted by foreign powers. To insist on groundless, unreasonable claims, is an unwarrantable abuse of power; and to put in peril our national peace by assertion of these, is to violate at once the national charter, and the higher law of universal justice and good will.

The grand principle to be adopted by the North is this, that, because certain States of this Union see fit

to pronounce certain human beings within their territory to be property, foreign nations are not bound to regard and treat these persons as property, when brought within their jurisdiction. Of consequence, the national government has no claim on foreign governments, in regard to slaves carried beyond the limits of the South, and found in other countries. The master has no authority over them in a foreign land. They appear there as men. They have rights there as real, as sacred, as the country has from which they came, and these must on no account be sported with.

The rights of the individual lie at the very foundation of civil society, and society, truly constituted, confirms instead of taking them away. The simple idea of a nation is, that it is the union of a multitude to establish and enforce laws for the protection of every right. A nation is not to depart from this, its true idea, its primitive end, and deny to human beings entering its borders the common rights of humanity, because these men have been seized in another part of the world and reduced to the condition of chattels or brutes. One injustice does not induce the necessity of another. Because a man is wronged in one place, it does not follow that he must be wronged everywhere. A particular State cannot, by its form of legislation, bind the whole earth to become partakers with it in a crime. It would seem as if the fact of a man's having been injured on one spot, were rather a reason for his enjoying peculiar protection elsewhere.

The local municipal law which ordains slavery in a State, does not make it just; does not make man rightful property, even in the particular country where it is established. This law, however, is to be respected in

a certain sense by foreign nations. These must not enter the slave-holding country to enforce emancipation. But in thus restraining themselves, they acknowledge no moral right in the master, no moral validity in the law declaring man property. They act simply on the principle, that one nation is not to intermeddle with the legislation of another, be it wise or foolish, just or unjust. Foreign nations are not to touch a law creating slavery in a particular country, because they touch none of the laws there. If that country choose to ordain polygamy as in the Eastern world, or stealing as in Sparta, or prostitution as in some established religions of antiquity, no other nations can interfere to repeal these ordinances. But, because unmolested in the place of their birth, are these institutions to be carried beyond it, to be regarded as sacred by other governments, and not only to be allowed, but to be enforced in foreign regions? Shall a Mahometan country hold itself wronged and declare war, because one of its subjects, carrying with him a hundred wives, cannot set up a harem in a Christian country; or cannot receive the aid and succour of the authorities of a foreign port in recovering fifty of his women who had found their way to the shore? Are the tribunals of a country to lend themselves to the execution of foreign laws which are opposed to its own? and which, not only its policy, but its religion and moral sense condemn?

The sum of these remarks is, that slavery is not to be spoken of as recognised in any sense whatever by nations which disclaim it; that to them it does not exist as a right anywhere; that in their own jurisdiction it cannot exist as a fact; and, from these views, it follows that no nation, allowing or ordaining slavery

within its limits, has a right to demand any recognition of it in any shape or degree beyond its own borders. To attempt to protect it, or to require protection for it in the ports of another country, is to set up not merely a groundless, but an iniquitous claim. To charge another country with wrong-doing for not aiding us to retain this property, is to do wrong ourselves, and to offer an insult to a more righteous community.

The Constitution, then, which commits to the national authorities the maintenance of our rights abroad, is transcended, its powers are unwarrantably stretched, when the government goes abroad to claim respect in any form or degree to the slave laws of a part of this country, or when it introduces slavery at all as a matter of controversy into our discussions with foreign powers. To these, slavery does not exist. In their own sphere they do not become accountable to us, by utter disregard of the slave laws of the South, or by refusing to see anything but men in the slaves of that region, when carried by any means whatever within their bounds. Slavery is a word which should never be uttered between us and foreign States. It is as local a matter as the licensing of gambling-houses at New-Orleans, and can with no more fitness be made a matter of diplomacy. It is we who are guilty of encroachment, when we deny the right of other nations to follow their own laws rather than ours within their own limits, and to regard as men all human beings who enter their ports.

When we look into the Constitution, we see not one express obligation imposed in regard to slavery. "Persons held to service or labour in one State under the laws thereof," and who escape from it, are to be restored. This language, as we have seen in the first

part of this Tract, was adopted to exclude the recognition of the lawfulness of slavery "in a moral point of view." The Constitution, in requiring the surrender of slaves in one case only, leaves them in all other cases to come under the operation of the laws of the Free States, when found within the limits of the same. Does not the Constitution, then, plainly expect that slaves from the South, if carried into foreign ports, will fall under the operation of the laws established there?

There is still another view. Slavery is limited in this country to one region. In the rest of the country it does not exist; and still more, it is regarded as a violation of the law of nature and of God. Now the general government, when it calls on foreign nations to respect the claims of the slave-holder, speaks in the name, not merely of the Slave States, but of the Free; in the name of the whole people. And ought the whole people to be thus committed to the cause of slavery, unless an undoubted unequivocal obligation is imposed on them by the Constitution to assume its defence; unless a clear case can be made out against the Free States? The Constitution is to be explained in part by the known views of its authors. We have seen how slow they were to recognise a moral right in slavery. Did they intend that we should assert its claims to the ends of the earth?

It is true the national government has interfered to claim slaves thrown on a foreign shore, and this consideration is of weight. But in so grave an affair, it does not decide the constitutional question. That the administration of the national government has been unduly swayed by the slave-holding portion of the country, we of the North believe. That under this influence an

unwarrantable extension of constitutional powers has taken place is very conceivable. False interpretations of such an instrument, which favour the interests of one part of the people, without apparently touching the rest of the community, easily steal into the public policy. Time alone exposes them, and time ought not to be alleged as a reason for their continuance.

In interpreting the Constitution, it is not only necessary to consult the history of the period of its formation, but to apply to it the principles of universal justice. Its authors honoured these, and did not intend to establish a government in hostility to them. They acted in the spirit of reverence for human rights. This is eminently the spirit of the Constitution, and by this it should be construed. Doubtful articles should receive an interpretation which will bring them into harmony with the immutable laws of duty. Any other construction virtually falls to the ground. It is of no force, for it cannot shake the authority of God. On these principles we maintain that the Constitution does not and cannot bind the government to demand from the whole human race, respect to the municipal law of Southern slavery.

This topic is not a merely speculative one, but of great practical importance. Our honour as a people is involved in the construction of the Constitution now pleaded for. This is not the day for setting up pretentions in favour of slavery, for demanding from the whole civilised world succour and countenance in enforcing our property in man. We disgrace ourselves in sending abroad ministers on such a message. We should regard our character too much, to thrust the deformity and stench of slavery into the eyes and nos-

trils of the world. We should regard too much the reputation of honourable men, who represent us in foreign countries, to employ them in this low work. An American, alive to his country's honour, cannot easily bear this humiliation abroad. It is enough, that, in our private intercourse with foreigners, we are set down as citizens of a slave-holding country. But we need not, and ought not to hold up our shame in the blaze of courts, in the high places of the world. We ought not industriously to invite men everywhere to inspect our wounds and ulcers. Let us keep our dishonour at home. The Free States especially should shrink from this exposure. They should insist, that slavery shall be a state interest, not a national concern —that this brand shall not be fixed on our diplomacy, on our foreign policy—that the name of American shall not become synonymous everywhere with oppression.

But something more than dishonour is to be feared, if our Government shall persevere in its efforts for maintaining the claims of slave-holders in foreign countries. Such claims, if asserted in earnest, must issue in war, for they cannot be acceded to. England has taken her ground on this matter; so ought the Free States. On this point we ought to speak plainly, unconditionally, without softening language. We ought to say to the South, to Congress, to the world: "We *will not* fight for slavery. We can die for Truth, for Justice, for Rights. We will not die or inflict death, in support of wrongs." In truth this spirit, this determination, exists now so extensively in the Free States, that it is utterly impossible for a war to be carried on in behalf of slavery; and such being the fact, all diplomacy in its behalf becomes a mockery. It is a disgraceful show

for no possible benefit. Even could war be declared for this end, the deep moral feeling of a large part of the community would rob it of all energy, and would ensure defeat and shame. Bad as we think men, they cannot fight against their consciences. The physical nature finds its strength in the moral. The rudest soldiers are sustained by the idea of acting under some lawful authority; and on this account have an advantage over pirates, who either cower, or abandon themselves to a desperation, which, by robbing them of a guiding intelligence, makes them an easier prey. In proportion as a people become enlightened, and especially in proportion as they recognise the principles of Christianity, it is harder to drive them into a war. The moral sense, which in an ignorant age or community is easily blinded, cannot in their case be imposed on without much skilful sophistry. They take the justice of a war less and less on trust. They must see that they have right on their side, or they are no match for a foe. This country has the best materials for an army in a righteous cause, and the worst in a wicked one. No martial law could drive us to battle for the slave-holder's claim to the aid or countenance of foreign powers. We could not fight in such a quarrel. Our "hands would hang down," as truly as if loaded with material chains. To fight for a cause at which we blush! for a cause which conscience protests against! for a cause on which we dare not ask the blessing of God! The thing is impossible. Our moral sympathies would desert to our foe. We should honour him for not suffering a slave to tread his soil. God keep us from being plunged into a war of any kind! But if the evil is to be borne, let us have, at least, the

consolation that our blood is shed for undoubted rights; that we have truth, justice, honour on our side; that religion, freedom, and humanity are not leagued with our foe.

> "Thrice is he arm'd who hath his quarrel just;
> And he but naked, though lock'd up in steel,
> Whose conscience with injustice is corrupted."

I proceed, in the third place, to another topic which will complete my remarks on the duties of the Free States in relation to slavery, under the present provisions of the Constitution. These States are bound to insist on the *abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia.* Their power in this regard is unquestionable. To Congress is committed exclusively the government of the District, and it is committed without any restrictions. In this sphere of its action, the general government has no limitations, but those which are found in the principles of the Constitution and of universal justice. The power of abolishing slavery in the District is a rightful one, and must be lodged somewhere, and can be exercised by Congress alone. And this authority ought not to sleep.

Slavery in the District of Columbia is not Southern slavery. It has no local character. It is the slavery of the United States! It belongs equally to the free and to the slave-holding portion of the country. It is *our* institution, as truly as if it were planted in the midst of us; for this District is the common ground of the nation. Its institutions exist solely by authority of the nation. They are as truly expressions of the national will, as any acts of Congress whatever. We all uphold the slave code, under which men are bought and sold, and whipped at their masters' pleasure. Every

slave auction in the District is held under our legislation. We are even told, that the prison of the District is used for the safe-keeping of the slaves who are brought there for sale. In the former part of these remarks, I said that the Free States had no participation in this evil. I forgot the District of Columbia. There we sustain it as truly as we support the navy or army. It ought then to be abolished at once. And in urging this action, we express no hostility towards Southern institutions. We do not think of the South. We see within a spot under our jurisdiction, a great wrong sustained by law. For this law we are responsible. For all its fruits we must give account. We owe then to God, to conscience, to rectitude, our best efforts for its abolition. We have no thought of limiting Southern institutions. It is our own unjust, unhallowed institution which we resolve no longer to maintain. Can the Free States consent to continue their partnership in this wrong? They have not even the poor consolation of profiting by the crime. The handful of slaves in the District may be of some worth to a few masters, but are utterly insignificant in their relation to the country. They might be bought by the government and set free at less expense than is incurred in passing many an act of Congress.

Emancipation in the present case is opposed by the South, not on account of any harm to be endured by the District or the country, but simply because this measure would be a public formal utterance of the moral conviction of the Free States on the subject of slavery. Our case is a hard one indeed. We are required to support what we abhor, because by withdrawing our support we shall express our abhorrence of it.

We must go on sinning, lest we become witnesses against sin. Could we root slavery out of the District without declaring it to be evil, emancipation would be comparatively easy; but we are required to sustain it, because we think it evil, and must not show our thoughts. We must cling to a wrong, because our associates at the South will not consent to the reproof implied in our desertion of it. And can it be that we are so wanting in moral principle and force, as to yield to these passionate partners? Is not our path clear? Can anything authorise us to sanction slavery by solemn acts of legislation? Are any violations of right so iniquitous as those which are perpetrated by law, by that function of sovereignty which has the maintenance of right for its foundation and end? Can it be that the Free States send their most illustrious men to Congress, to set their seal to slavery? that the National Government, intended to be the centre of what is most august and imposing in our land, should be turned into a legislature of a slave district, and should put forth its vast powers in sustaining a barbarous slave code? If this must be, then does it not seem fit, that the national eagle should add the whip of the overseer to the arrows and olive-branch which he now grasps in his talons?

But this is not all. The District of Columbia is not only tainted with slavery, but it is a great, I believe the greatest, slave-market in our country. To this, human beings are driven as cattle; driven sometimes, if not often, in chains. It is even reported, that the slave-coffle is sometimes headed by the flag of the United States. To this spot, the metropolis of our nation, are brought multitudes of our fellow-creatures, torn from their homes by force, and for others' gain, and heart-

stricken by the thought of birth-place and friends to be seen no more. Here women are widowed and children made orphans, whilst the husband and the parent still live. A more cruel minister than Death has been at work in their forsaken huts. These wronged fellow-beings are then set up for sale, and women, as well as men, are subjected to an examination, like that which draught-horses undergo at an auction. That the seat of the National Government should be made a mart for this shameful traffic, is not to be endured. On this point some deference is due to the Free States and the character of the country. The spot on which we all meet as equals, and which is equally under the jurisdiction of all, ought to be kept clean from a trade which the majority think inhuman and a disgrace to the land. On this point there can be no doubt as to the constitutional power of Congress. That body may certainly remove a nuisance from a spot which is subject to its unrestricted authority. A common township may abate nuisances. In many of the States the municipal authorities may prohibit, if they see fit, the sale of ardent spirits within their limits. Congress may certainly say, that the "ten-miles square" ceded to the United States shall not be a market for slaves. Washington holds a peculiar relation to the country. Foreigners repair to it as the spot in which to observe our institutions. That slavery, our chief stain, should be exposed most ostentatiously at the seat of government, is a violation of national decency, a sign of moral obtuseness, of insensibility to the moral judgment of mankind, which ought immediately to cease.

I have now spoken of the Duties of the Free States

under the Constitution, as it now exists. I proceed to a still higher Duty incumbent on them, which is, to seek earnestly and resolutely for such amendments of the Constitution, as shall entirely release them from the obligation of yielding support in any way or degree to slavery, and shall so determine the relation between the Free and Slave States, as to put an end to all collision on this subject.

This I have said is a Duty, and as such it should be constantly regarded. The Free States should act in it with the calmness and inflexibleness of Principle, avoiding on the one hand passionateness, vehemence, invective, and on the other a spirit of expediency. It is a question not of interest but of Rights, and consequently above expediency. Happily, interest and duty go together in this matter; and were it not so, our first homage should be paid to the Right. The Free States should say calmly but firmly to the South: "We cannot participate in slavery. It is yours, wholly and exclusively. On you alone the responsibility rests. You must maintain and defend it by your own arms. As respects slavery, we are distinct communities, as truly, as in respect to institutions for the support of the poor or for the education of our children. Your slavery is no national concern. The nation must know nothing of it, must do nothing in reference to it. We will not touch your slaves, to free or restore them. Our powers in the State or National Governments, shall not be used to destroy or to uphold your peculiar institutions. We only ask such modifications of the national charter as shall set us free from all obligation to uphold what we condemn. In regard to slavery, the line between the Slave and the Free States is a great gulf. You must

not pass it to enforce your supposed rights as slaveholders, nor will we cross it to annul or violate the laws on which this evil system rests."

The reasons for thus modifying the Constitution are numerous. The first has been again and again intimated. The moral sentiment of the North demands it. Since the adoption of the Constitution, a new state of mind in regard to slavery has spread through the civilised world. It is not of American growth only, but subsists and acts more powerfully abroad than at home. Slavery, regarded formerly as a question of great interest, is now a question of conscience. Vast numbers in the Free States cannot, without self-reproach, give it sanction or aid. From many family altars, the prayer rises to God for our brethren in bonds. The anti-slavery principle finds utterance in our churches, by our firesides, and in our public meetings. Now, the Constitution ought to be brought into harmony with the moral convictions of the people. A government resisting these, deprives itself of its chief support. If we were to call on the South for a modification of the Constitution, under the influence of any private motives, any interests, any passions, we ought not to be heard. But the slaveholders, as men of principle and of honour, should shrink from asking us to do what we deliberately and conscientiously condemn. Allow it, that our moral sense is too scrupulous. We must still reverence and obey it. We have no higher law than our conviction of duty. We ought especially not to be asked to resist it, in a case like the present, when our conscience is in unison with the conscience of the civilised world. Christendom responds to our reprobation of slavery; and can we be expected to surrender our principles to

a handful of men personally interested in the evil? We say to the South: "We are willing to be joined with you as a nation for weal or for wo. We reach to you the hand of fellowship. We ask but one thing; do not require us to surrender what is dearer than life or nation, our sense of duty, our loyalty to conscience and God." *Will* an honourable people demand this sacrifice from us? Great deference is due to the moral sense of a community. This should take rank above political considerations. To ask a people to trifle with and slight it, is to invite them to self-degradation. No profit can repay their loss, no accession of power can hide their shame.

Another reason for modifying the Constitution, so that slavery shall be wholly excluded from the class of national objects, is found in the fact, that this interest, if allowed to sustain itself by the national arm, will intertwine itself more and more with public measures, and will colour our whole policy, so that the Free States will be more and more compelled to link themselves with its support. Could the agency of the government in regard to this subject be rigidly defined, the evil would be more tolerable. But it is natural that the slave-holding States should seek to make the national power as far as possible a buttress of their "peculiar institution." It is as slave-holders, rather than as Americans, that they stand in Congress; slavery must be secured, whatever befall other interests of the country. The people of the North little understand what the National Government has done for the "peculiar institution" of the South. It has been and is the friend of the slave-holder, and the enemy of the slave. The National Government authorises not only the apprehension and

imprisonment, in the District of Columbia, of a coloured man suspected of being a runaway, but the sale of him as a slave, if within a certain time he cannot prove his freedom. The National Government has endeavoured to obtain by negotiation the restoration of fugitive slaves, who had sought and found freedom in Canada, and has offered in return to restore fugitives from the West Indies. It has disgraced itself, in the view of all Europe, by claiming as property, slaves who have been shipwrecked on the British islands, and who by touching British soil had become free. It has instructed its representative at Madrid to announce to the Spanish Court, "that the emancipation of the slave population of Cuba would be very severely felt in the adjacent shores of the United States." It has purchased a vast unsettled territory, which it has given up to be overrun with slavery. Are we willing that the national power, in which all the States have a common interest and share, and for the use of which we are all responsible, should be so employed?

How far slavery does and will sway the National Government may be judged from the fact, that it is a bond of union to all who participate in it; that the South is prepared by it for a co-operation unknown at the North; and that, of consequence, it gives to the South, in no small degree, the control of the country. The jealousies of the slave-holder never sleep. They mix with and determine our public policy in matters which we might think least open to this pernicious influence. Of late, one of the most distinguished men in the country,* the citizen of a Free State, was nominated as Minister to the English Court. He had one

* Edward Everett.

qualification, perhaps, above any man who could have been selected for the office; that is, a thorough acquaintance with our controversy with Great Britain as to the northern boundary. His large intellectual culture, his literary eminence, his admirable powers, and his experience in public affairs, fitted him to represent the United States in the metropolis of Europe, where a man of narrow education and ordinary powers would dishonour his country. But the nomination of this gentleman was resisted vehemently in the Senate, on the ground that he had expressed his moral opposition to slavery; and that he would not, therefore, plead the cause of slavery at the Court of St. James. For a time his appointment was despaired of, and it was confirmed at last only by a firmness of remonstrance which the South could not safely oppose. The action of the slave-holders on this subject, though not carried through, does not the less manifest their spirit and policy. They have virtually expressed their purpose to exclude from all places of trust and honour every man from the North who expresses his moral feelings against slavery. And as these feelings are spreading among us and gaining strength, the slave-holder has virtually passed a sentence of proscription on the North. If possible, the door of the Cabinet is to be shut in our faces. The executive power must be lodged in other hands. Our most enlightened and virtuous citizens must not represent the country abroad. This rejection of a man on the ground of a moral conviction which pervades the North, is equivalent to a general disfranchisement. A new test for office, never dreamed of before, is to exclude us from the service of the country in those high public trusts which are the chief instruments of public

influence. And can we consent to become a proscribed race? Shall our adherence to great principles be punished by civil degradation? Can we renounce all kindred with our fathers, and suffer our very love of freedom and justice to be a brand of disqualification for offices which by the Constitution are thrown equally open to all?

The nomination of our Minister to England was all but rejected, and in this we see how slavery has complicated itself with our most important national affairs; how it determines the weightiest acts of the General Government; how it taints our foreign as well as domestic policy. The North cannot hope to escape with lending a helping hand, now and then, to Southern institutions. We must put our shoulders to the wheel. We must be governed throughout with reference to slavery. Were this the place, it would be easy to show how the South, by a skilful management of the parties of the North, has bent and may continue to bend the General Government to its purposes; how slavery has been made a means of concentrating power into the hands of those who uphold it. This institution is not a narrow interest, seldom intruding itself, too trifling to quarrel about; but a poisonous element, acting subtly on public affairs when it seems to be quiet, and sometimes breaking out into violences dishonourable to our national councils, and menacing to the Union. Its influences are not concealed; and the time has come for solemn, earnest effort to sever it from the government which it would usurp.

I proceed to offer another reason for so modifying the Constitution as to exclude slavery from its objects, which is akin to the last, but so important as to deserve

distinct consideration. The slave-power in Congress not only mixes with and controls public measures, but it threatens our dearest rights and liberties. It is natural for every power to act and manifest itself according to its peculiar character. We ought not then to wonder, that slavery should set at nought all rights with which it comes in conflict. And yet that it should be so bold, so audacious, as it has proved itself, awakens some astonishment. We believed, that the Constitution had placed some rights above the reach of any party or power; yet on these especially slavery has laid its hand. The right of Petition is one of the last we might suppose to be denied to a people. It has such a foundation in nature, that it is respected where other rights are trodden down. The Despot opens his ears to the petitions of his subjects. But in the Congress of a free people, petitions and memorials from large numbers of citizens, and even from public bodies, have been treated with indignity, and refused a hearing. But this is not all. The slave power has, if possible, taken a more daring step. A member of the House of Representatives* has been censured by that body for presenting a series of grave resolutions, asserting the relation of the government to slavery, and denying the extension of its powers to slaves removed beyond our jurisdiction.

Liberty of speech has been secured to us by an express provision of the Constitution; and if this right is especially inviolable in any person, it is in the Representative of the people, standing up in Congress to utter his own views and those of his constituents, on great questions of public policy. That such a man should be put

* Joshua R. Giddings.

to silence, should be subjected to censure for expressing his conviction in the calmest style, is a stretch of power, an excess of tyranny, which would have been pronounced impossible a few years since. This is to invade Liberty in her holiest place, her last refuge. It was not the individual who was wronged, but the constituents in whose name he spoke; the State from which he came; the whole nation, who can only be heard through its representatives.

This act stands alone, we conceive, in representative bodies. I have inquired and cannot learn, that the English Parliament, omnipotent as it declares itself, ever offered this outrage to freedom, this insult to the people. Until this moment, the liberty of speech in Congress has been held so sacred, that the Representative in debate has been left to violate without reproof good manners and the decencies of social life; to bring dishonour on himself and his country, by coarseness and ribaldry; to consume hour after hour, perhaps the day, in declamations which have owed their inspiration less to wisdom than to wine. During this very session, we have witnessed the spectacle of members of the House of Representatives denouncing and insulting the President of the United States, a co-ordinate power of the government, and entitled to peculiar respect, as embodying and representing the nation to foreign countries; and this indecorum has been submitted to, lest the freedom of speech in that chamber should be encroached on. But because a Representative of high character has thought fit to express in the most unexciting style, his deliberate convictions on a solemn question which threatens the country with war, he has been subjected to the indignity of a public rebuke. And why

is he selected above all others for punishment? Because he has so interpreted the Constitution, as to deny both the right and the obligation of the government to protect slavery beyond the limit of the United States. For this sound exposition of the national charter, he is denied an immunity extended to the brawler and traducer. Can a precedent more fatal to freedom be conceived? Where is this tyranny to stop? Is there any doctrine, any construction of the Constitution, any vindication of the rights of his constituents, that may chance to be unpopular, for which a Representative may not incur this public rebuke? Is the tameness of the Free States under this usurpation, the way to suppress it? If even in Congress unpopular truth may not be spoken, what pledge have we that it may be uttered anywhere else? A blow has been struck at freedom of speech in all its forms; and in regard to no other right should we be so jealous as in regard to this. As long as we retain this, we retain the means of defending all our other rights, of redressing all wrongs. Take this away, and we have no redress but in force.

By the Constitution, each house of Congress has power to punish a member for disorderly behaviour. In England, too, members may be punished for "contempt of the house." But in these cases, it is not intended to lay the least restraint on the discussion of public measures. In these cases the sacredness of the representative character is not violated. On the contrary, the individual is punished for insulting the representative body, the honour of which is indeed his own. It is to preserve the house from disorders, which would infringe its privilege of free discussion, that this

power over its members is chiefly required. The act of punishing a member for speaking his mind on general topics, on the principles of the Constitution, is an unprecedented tyranny which ought to have raised a burst of indignation from one end of the country to the other. What right may not be invaded next? If the freedom of the press, if the right of worshipping God, shall be thought to come in conflict with slavery, what reason have we to hope that these, or any other of our liberties, will escape violation? Nothing is more common in life than to see men, who are accustomed to one outrage on rights, emboldened to maintain this by others and more flagrant. This experience of the usurpations of the slave-power should teach us to avoid all contact with it, to exclude it from our National Government. On this point of slavery, the two sections of the country should be separate nations. They should hold no communion.

These remarks suggest another reason for so modifying the Constitution, as to release the Free States from all action on slavery. It is almost too plain a reason to be named, and yet too important to be overlooked. Until such modification be made, the country can know no peace. The Free and Slave-holding States will meet in Congress, not to maintain peace, not to provide for the common liberty, the common welfare, the common defence, but for war. Subjects of public interest will not be looked at simply, nakedly, according to their own merits, but through the medium of jealousy and hatred, and according to their apparent bearing on slavery. The "peculiar institution" of the South is peculiarly sensitive and irritable. It detects signs and menaces of danger in harmless move-

ments, and does not weigh its words in resenting supposed injury. With this root of bitterness in our government, we must expect distracted public councils; we must witness fiery passions in the place of wise deliberations. The different sections of the country will become hostile camps.

It is painful to advert to the style of debate which the subject of slavery almost always excites in Congress, because it can hardly be spoken of without stirring up unpleasant feeling. On this subject the fiery temperament of the South disdains control. The North, it is true, has the comfort of knowing, that it is better to be insulted than to insult; and yet it is a position not very favourable to the temper or to self-respect, to be compelled to listen to such language as Northern men hear on the floor of Congress. The consequences are inevitable. Forbearance has limits; and reproach awakens reaction. Already a venerable representative from a Free State,* whose moral courage, in union with his great powers, places him at the head of the public men of the country, has presented a front of stern opposition to the violence of the South. We thank him for his magnanimity. It is, perhaps, the greatest public service ever rendered in Congress to the North; for no man serves his country like him who exalts its spirit. Still we must allow, that the eloquence of this illustrious statesman has not tended to heal the wounds of the nation; and as friends of the Union, we must earnestly desire to banish from our public councils the irritating subject, which has given birth to the conflicts in which he has borne so distinguished a part. No remedy short of this will meet the evil, nor can the remedy be

* John Quincy Adams.

applied too suddenly. The breach is widening every day. The unwillingness of the North to participate in slavery grows stronger every day. The love of the Union has suppressed as yet the free utterance of this feeling; but the restraints of prudence are continually giving way. Slavery will not much longer have the floor of the Senate to itself, or rule the House with an iron hand. Freedom will find tongues there. The open advocates of human rights, as yet a small heroic band, will spring up as a host. Is it not the part of wisdom to put an end to these deadly feuds? Is the Union to become a name? Is its chief good, concord, to be given up in despair? And must not concord be despaired of as long as slavery shall enter into the discussions of Congress? The dissensions growing out of slavery throw a fearful uncertainty over the fortunes of this country. Let us end them at once by dissolving wholly the connection between slavery and our national concerns.

There is one consideration which should reconcile the South to such an arrangement. The Constitution, if not so modified, can render little service to slavery. In this country, no law, no constitution can prevail against the moral convictions of the people. These are stronger than parchments, statutes, or tribunals. There is a feeling in regard to slavery, spreading rapidly, which cannot be withstood. It is not a fanaticism, a fever, but a calm moral, religious persuasion; and whatever in our institutions opposes this, will be a dead letter. No violence is needed to annul a law which the moral feelings of a free community condemn. The simple abstinence of the people from action in favour of an unrighteous law, and the displeasure with which they visit such as are officious in its support,

will avail more than armies. The South, then, in admitting such changes of the Constitution as are proposed, will make no great sacrifice. Slavery must at any rate cease to look northward for aid. Let it then consent to retire within its own bounds. Let it not mix itself with our national affairs. Let the word slavery no longer be named within the walls of Congress. Such is the good now to be sought. The North should be stirred up to demand it with one voice. Petitions, memorials, directed to this end, should be poured in upon Congress as a flood. The Free States should employ political action in regard to slavery for one purpose alone, and that is, to prevent all future political action on the subject; to sever it wholly from the government; to save the country from its disturbing influence.

Such seems to me to be the urgent duty of the Free States. But it is not their whole duty. They are not to think of themselves only in the changes which are to be made. The South has claims as well as ourselves. Whilst we say we cannot give aid in holding the slaves in bondage, we are bound to pledge ourselves to abstain from all action on the slaves to set them free. We must not use the Union as a means of access to that part of the Southern population. We must regard them as belonging to foreign states, and must interfere with them no more than with the serfs of Russia or the bondmen of Turkey. On this point we should consent to enter into strict terms with the South. The best human feelings have tendencies to excess. The hostility to slavery at the North may pass its due bounds, and adopt modes of action which the South has a right to repel; and from these we should bind ourselves to

abstain. For example: we have heard of men who have entered the Southern States to incite and aid the slaves to take flight. We have also seen a convention at the North of highly respected men preparing and publishing an address to the slaves, in which they are exhorted to fly from bondage, and to feel no scruple in seizing and using horse or boat which may facilitate their escape. All such interference with the slave is wrong, and should cease. It gives some countenance to the predictions of cautious men as to the issues of the anti-slavery movement. It is a sign that the enemies of slavery are losing their patience, calmness and self-controlling wisdom; that they cannot wait for the blessing of Providence on holy efforts; that the grandeur of the end is in danger of blinding them as to the character of the means.

We are bound to abstain from all such action on the slaves, not because the master has a rightful property in them, but on the plain ground that a Slave-holding State is a body politic, a civil community, the peace and order of which must not be invaded by the members of a foreign State. It is plain, that if the action of a foreign community on the slave begin and be allowed, no limits to it can be prescribed, and insurrection and massacre are its almost necessary effects. I certainly wish the slave to flee, if he can do it without bloodshed and violence, and can find a shelter for his rights, without exposing his character to overwhelming temptation. But were the Free States to incite the whole mass of slaves to fly; were one united, thrilling, exasperating cry from the North to ring through the South, and to possess the millions who are in bondage with the passion for escape; would not society be convulsed

to its centre? and who of us could avert the terrible crimes which would be perpetrated in the name of liberty? No. Earnestly as I oppose slavery, I deprecate all interference with the slave within the jurisdiction of the Slave-holding States. I will plead his cause with whatever strength God has given me. But I can do no more. God forbid that I should work out his deliverance by force and blood.

These remarks are the more important, because there seem to be growing up among us looser ideas than formerly prevailed on the subject of inciting the slaves to vindicate their rights. The common language leads to error. We are told, and told truly, that the slave-holder has no property in the man whom he oppresses; that the slave has a right to immediate freedom; and the inference, which some make, is, that the slave is authorised to use, without regard to consequences, the means of emancipation. The next inference is, that he is to be urged and aided to break his chain. But these views are too sweeping, and need important modifications.

The slave has a right to liberty; but a right does not imply that it may be asserted by any and every means. There is a great law of humanity to which all are subject, the bond as well as the free, and which we must never lose sight of in redressing wrongs, or in claiming and insisting on our due. The slave cannot innocently adopt any and every expedient for vindicating his liberty. He is bound to waive his right, if in maintaining it he is to violate the law of humanity, and to spread general ruin. Were I confined unjustly to a house, I should have no right to free myself by setting it on fire, if thereby a family should be destroyed. An

impressed seaman cannot innocently withhold his service in a storm, and would be bound to work even in ordinary weather, if this were needed to save the ship from foundering. We owe a debt of humanity even to him who wrongs us, and especially to those who are linked with him, and who must suffer, perhaps perish with him, if we seek to redress our wrong.

The slave is not property. He owes nothing as a slave to his master. On the contrary, the debt is on his master's side. But though owing nothing as a slave, he owes much as a man. He must not, for the sake of his own liberty, involve a household in destruction. He must not combine with fellow slaves, and expose a community of men, women, children, to brutal outrage and massacre. When the chain can only be broken by inhumanity, he has no right to break it. A higher duty than that of asserting personal rights is laid on him. He is bound by divine authority, by the Christian law, by enlightened conscience, to submit to his hard fate.

The slave's right to liberty then is a qualified one; qualified not in the slightest degree by any right of property in his master, but solely by the great law of humanity. He is a man under all the obligations of a member of the human family, and, therefore, bound at all times to unite a regard for others with a regard to himself. His master, indeed, denies his humanity, and treats him as a brute; and were he what his master deems him, he might innocently at any moment cut the throats of his master and master's wife and child. But his human nature, though trampled on, endures, and lays on him obligation to refrain from cruelty. From these views we learn that the right of the slave

to free himself is not to be urged on him without reserve.

In these remarks, I do not mean to say that I should blame the slave for rising at any moment against his master. In so doing, he would incur no guilt; for in his ignorance he cannot comprehend why he should forbear. He would vindicate an undoubted right. His rude conscience would acquit him, and far be it from me to condemn. But we, who are more enlightened, who know the consequences of revolt, should beware of rousing that wild mass of degraded men to the assertion of their rights. Such consequences humanity commands us to respect. Were it not for these, I would summon that mass as loudly as any to escape. Could I, by my words, so awaken and guide the millions of slaves, that, without violence and bloodshed, they could reach safely a land of freedom and order, I would shout in thunder-tones, Fly, fly! But it is not given us thus to act in human affairs. It is not given us to enter and revolutionise a state, to subvert old institutions and plant new, without carrying with us strife, tumult, bloodshed, horrible crimes. The law of humanity then restrains us from this direct agency on other states. It restrains us from abandoning ourselves to our zeal for the oppressed. It restrains us from kindling the passions of the slave. It commands us to teach him patience and love.

May I here be allowed a moment's digression, which, indeed, has important connections with the whole subject? The principle now laid down helps us to comprehend the language of the New Testament on the subject of slavery. The slave is again and again commanded by the Apostle to obey, and forbidden to pur-

loin, or to answer rudely; and from such passages it has been argued, that Christianity sanctions slavery. But the great question is, on what grounds, for what reasons, do the Scriptures enjoin obedience on the slave? Do they do so on the ground of any right of property in the master? This is the single question. Not an intimation to this effect is found in the Scriptures. They teach the slave to obey, not because he is a chattel, not because he is bound by human laws of property, but because he is bound by the Christian law of humanity and love; because he is bound everywhere to manifest a spirit of mildness and charity, and in this way to express the divine, elevating influences of his new religion.

At the introduction of Christianity, slavery was an unutterable abomination, more horrible than what exists now. Good and great men, refined women, were then liable to be reduced to bondage. On the conquest of a country, not only were prisoners of war sold as slaves, without regard to rank or character, but, as in the case of Judea, the mass of the peaceful population were doomed to the yoke. To suppose that the Apostles of Christ intended to sanction this infernal system, is an insult to those generous men, and a blasphemy against our pure and merciful faith. But slavery was then so inwoven into the institutions of society, the dangers and horrors of a servile war were so great, the consequences of a proclamation of universal liberty would have been so terrible, the perils to the cause of Christianity, had it been so taught, would have been so imminent, and the motives for manifesting Christianity at its birth, as a spirit of unbounded meekness and love, were so urgent, that the Apostles inculcated on the slaves an obedience free from every taint of dishonesty,

wrath, or revenge. Their great motive, as they stated it, was, that Christianity might not be spoken against, that it might be seen breathing love and uprightness into men, whose circumstances were peculiarly fitted to goad them to anger and revenge.

To suppose that the Apostles recognised the right of the master, because they taught mildness and patience to the slave, is to show a strange ignorance of the New Testament. Our religion, in its hostility to a spirit of retaliation, violence, and revenge, enforces submission and patience as strongly on the free as on the slave. It says to us: "If a man smite thee on the right cheek, turn to him the other also. If he take thy coat, let him have thy cloak also. And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain." Is this a recognition of our neighbour's right to smite us, to take our coat, and compel us to go a mile for his convenience?

Christianity has extended the law of humanity to a degree never dreamed of in earlier times, and but faintly comprehended now. It requires us all to love and serve our enemies, and to submit to unjust government, in language so strong and unqualified as to furnish an objection to its opposers; and in all these requisitions it has but one end, which is, to inspire the sufferer with forbearance and humanity, not to assert a right in the wrong-doer.

When I consider the tenderness which Christianity enjoins towards the injurious, I cannot but shrink from the lightness with which some speak of insurrection at the South. Were I to visit the slave, I should in every way discourage the spirit of violence and revenge. I should say, "Resist not evil: obey your master: forgive your enemies: put off wrath and hatred: put on meek-

ness and love: do not lie or steal: govern your passions: be kind to one another: by your example and counsels lift up the degraded around you: be true to your wives, and loving to your children. And do not deem your lot in every view the worst on earth: the time is coming when it will be found better to have been a slave than a master; better to have borne the yoke than to have laid it on another. God regards you with mercy; He offers you his best blessings: 'He resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble.'"

From all these views I am bound to discourage all action on the slaves on the part of those who reside in other States. When the individual slave flees to us, let us rejoice in his safe and innocent flight. But with the millions of slaves in the land of bondage we cannot intermeddle, without incurring imminent peril. The evil is too vast, rooted, complicated, terrible, for strangers to deal with, except by that moral influence which we are authorised and bound to oppose, firmly and fearlessly, to all oppression. We may and ought to mourn over the chain which weighs down millions of our brethren, and to rouse the sympathies and convictions of the world in aid of their violated rights. Our moral power we must not cease to oppose to the master's claim; but the Free States must not touch this evil by legislation or physical power, or by any direct agency on the servile population. God has marked out our sphere of duty, and no passionate sense of injustice, no burning desire to redress wrong, must carry us beyond it. Having fully done the work given us to do, we must leave the evil to the control of Him who has infinite means of controlling it, whose Almighty justice can shiver the chain of adamant, as a wreath of mist is scattered by the whirlwind.

I have thus set forth what seem to me the chief duties of the Free States in regard to slavery. First, they must insist on such constructions of the Constitution, as will save our own citizens from the grasp of this institution, as will prevent the extension of the powers of the government for its support beyond our own shores, and as will bring to an end slavery and the slave-trade in the District of Columbia; and, secondly, we must insist on such modifications of the Constitution, as will exempt us from every obligation to sustain and strengthen slavery, whilst, at the same time, we give every pledge not to use our relation to the slave-holder, as a means of acting on the slave. These are solemn duties, not to the slaves only or chiefly, but to ourselves also. They involve our peace at home and abroad. They touch alike our rights and interests. On our performance of these depend the perpetuity of the Union, and our rank among nations. Slavery, if it shall continue to be a national concern, and to insinuate itself into our domestic policy, will prove more and more a firebrand, a torch of the Furies. The agitation which it has produced is but the beginning of evils. Nothing but the separation of it from our federal system can give us peace.

The immediate purpose of these remarks has been answered. But the topic of the Duties of the Free States, in relation to slavery, has started various thoughts, and brought to view other duties, more or less connected with my primary object; and, as I have no desire to communicate again my thoughts on public affairs, I shall be glad to use this opportunity of disburdening my mind. My thoughts will arrange them-

selves under three heads, which, however imperfectly treated, deserve serious attention.

In the first place, the Free States are especially called to uphold the great Ideas or Principles which distinguish our country, and on which our Constitution rests. This may be said to be our highest political duty. Every country is characterised by certain great Ideas, which pervade the people and the government, and by these chiefly its rank is determined. When one idea predominates strongly above all others, it is a key to a nation's history. The great idea of Rome, that which the child drank in with his mother's milk, was Dominion. The great idea of France is Glory. In despotisms, the idea of the King or the Church possesses itself of the minds of the people, and a superstitious loyalty or piety becomes the badge of the inhabitants. The most interesting view of this country is the grandeur of the idea which has determined its history, and which is expressed in all its institutions. Take away this, and we have nothing to distinguish us. In the refined arts, in manners, in works of genius, we are as yet surpassed. From our youth and insulated position, our history has no dazzling brilliancy. But one distinction belongs to us. A great Idea from the beginning has been working in the minds of this people, and it broke forth with peculiar energy in our Revolution. This is the idea of Human Rights. In our Revolution, liberty was our watchword; but not a lawless liberty, not freedom from all restraint, but a moral freedom. Liberty was always regarded as each man's Right, imposing on every other man a moral obligation to abstain from doing it violence. Liberty and law were always united in our minds. By government, we

understood the concentration of the power of the whole community to protect the Rights of each and all its members. This was the grand idea on which all our institutions were built. We believed, that the rights of the people were safest, and alone safe, in their own keeping, and therefore we adopted popular forms. We looked, indeed, to government for the promotion of the public welfare, as well as for the defence of rights. But we felt that the former was included in the latter; that, in securing to every man the largest liberty, the right to exercise and improve all his powers, to elevate himself and his condition, and to govern himself, subject only to the limitation which the equal freedom of others imposes, we were providing most effectually for the common good. It was felt that, under this moral freedom, men's powers would expand, and would secure to them immeasurably greater good than could be conferred by a government intermeddling perpetually with the subject, and imposing minute restraints.

These views of human rights, which pervade and light up our history, may be expressed in one word. They are summed up in respect for the Individual Man. In all other countries, the man has been obscured, overpowered by rulers, merged in the state, made a means or tool. Here, every man has been recognised as having rights on which no one can trench without crime. The nation has recognised something greater than the nation's prosperity, than outward, material interests: and that is, Individual Right. In our Revolution, a dignity was seen in human nature, a generous confidence was placed in men. It was believed that they would attain to greater nobleness, by being left to govern themselves; that they would attain to greater

piety, by being left to worship God according to their own convictions; that they would attain to greater energy of intellect, and to higher truths, by being left to freedom of thought and utterance, than by the wisest forms of arbitrary rule. It was believed, that a universal expansion of the higher faculties was to be secured by increasing men's responsibilities, by giving them higher interests to watch over, by throwing them very much on themselves. Such is the grand idea which lies at the root of our institutions; such the fundamental doctrines of the political creed into which we have all been baptised.

It is to the Free States that the guardianship of this true faith peculiarly belongs. Their institutions are most in harmony with it; and they need to be reminded of this duty, because, under the happiest circumstances, the idea of Human Rights is easily obscured; because there is always a tendency to exalt worldly, material interests above it. The recent history of the country shows the worship of wealth taking the place of reverence for liberty and universal justice. The Free States are called to watch against this peril, to regard government, not as a machine for creating wealth, for subserving individual cupidity, for furnishing facilities of boundless speculation, but as a moral institution, designed to secure Universal Right, to protect every man in the liberties and immunities through which he is to work out his highest good.

It must not, however, be imagined, that the great idea of our country is to be wrought out or realised by government alone. This is, indeed, an important instrument, but it does not cover the whole field of human rights. The most precious of these it can hardly touch.

Government is, after all, a coarse machine, very narrow in its operations, doing little for human advancement in comparison with other influences. A man has other rights than those of property and person, which the government takes under its protection. He has a right to be regarded and treated as a man, as a being who has excellent powers and a high destiny. He has a right to sympathy and deference, a right to be helped in the improvement of his nature, a right to share in the intelligence of the community, a right to the means not only of bodily but of spiritual well-being. These rights a government can do little to protect or aid. Yet on these, human progress chiefly rests. To bring these into clear light, to incorporate a reverential feeling for these, not only into government, but into manners and social life; this is the grand work to which our country is called.

In this country, the passion for wealth is a mighty force, acting in hostility to the great Idea which rules in our institutions. Property continually tends to become a more vivid idea than right. In the struggle for private accumulation, the worth of every human being is overlooked. The importance of every man's progress is forgotten. We must contend for this great idea. They who hold it must spread it around them. The truth must be sounded in the ears of men, that the grand end of society is to place within reach of all its members the means of improvement, of elevation, of the true happiness of man. There is a higher duty than to build almshouses for the poor, and that is, to save men from being degraded to the blighting influence of an almshouse. Man has a right to something more than bread to keep him from starving. He has

a right to the aids and encouragements and culture, by which he may fulfil the destiny of a man; and until society is brought to recognise and reverence this, it will continue to groan under its present miseries.

Let me repeat, that government alone cannot realise the great Idea of this country; that is, cannot secure to every man all his rights. Legislation has its limits. It is a power to be wielded against a few evils only. It acts by physical force, and all the higher improvements of human beings come from truth and love. Government does little more than place society in a condition, which favours the action of higher powers than its own. A great Idea may be stamped on the government, and be contradicted in common life. It is very possible under popular forms, that a spirit of exclusiveness and of contempt for the multitude, that impassable social barriers, and the degradation of large masses, may continue as truly as under aristocratic forms. The spirit of society, not an outward institution, is the mighty power by which the hard lot of man is to be meliorated. The great Idea that every human being has a right to the means of exercising and improving his highest powers, must pass from a cold speculation into a living conviction, and then society will begin in earnest to accomplish its end. This great Idea exists as yet only as a germ, in the most advanced communities, and is working faintly. But it cannot die. We hear, indeed, much desponding language about society. The cant of the day is the cant of indifference or despair. But let it not discourage us. It is, indeed, possible that this country may sink beneath the work imposed on it by Providence, and instead of bringing the world into its debt, may throw new darkness over

human hope. But great ideas, once brought to light, do not die. The multitude of men through the civilised world are catching some glimpses, however indistinct, of a higher lot; are waking up to something higher than animal good. There is springing up an aspiration among them, which, however dreaded as a dangerous restlessness, is the natural working of the human spirit, whenever it emerges from gross ignorance, and seizes on some vague idea of its rights. Thank God, it is natural for man to aspire; and this aspiration ceases to be dangerous, just in proportion as the intelligent members of society interpret it aright, and respond to it, and give themselves to the work of raising their brethren. If, through self-indulgence or pride, they decline this work, the aspiration will not cease; but growing up under resistance or contempt, it may become a spirit of hostility, conflict, revenge.

The fate of this country depends on nothing so much as on the growth or decline of the great Idea which lies at the foundation of all our institutions: the idea of the sacredness of every man's right, of the respect due to every human being. This exists among us. It has stamped itself on government. It is now to stamp itself on manners and common life; a far harder work. It will then create a society such as men have not anticipated, but which is not to be despaired of, if Christianity be divine, or if the highest aspirations of the soul be true. It is only in the Free States that the great Idea of which I have spoken can be followed out. It is denied openly, flagrantly, where slavery exists. To be true to it, is our first political, social duty.

I proceed to another important topic, and that is,

the duty of the Free States in relation to the Union. They and the Slave-holding States constitute one people. Is this tie to continue, or to be dissolved? It cannot be disguised that this subject is growing into importance. The South has talked recklessly about disunion. The more quiet North has said little, but thought more; and there are now not a few who speak of the Union as doomed to dissolution, whilst a few seem disposed to hasten the evil day. Some approach the subject not as politicians, but as religious men, bound first to inquire into the moral fitness of political arrangements; and they have come to the conclusion, that a union with states sustaining slavery is unjust, and ought to be renounced, at whatever cost. That the Union is in danger, is not to be admitted. Its strength would be made manifest by the attempt to dissolve it. But anything which menaces it deserves attention. So great a good should be exposed to no hazard which can be shunned.

The Union is an inestimable good. It is to be prized for its own sake, to be prized not merely or chiefly for its commercial benefits, or any pecuniary advantages, but simply as Union, simply as a pacific relation between communities, which without this tie would be exposed to ruinous collisions. To secure this boon we should willingly make great sacrifices. So full of crime and misery are hostile relations between neighbouring rival states, that a degree of misgovernment should be preferred to the danger of conflict. Disunion would not only embroil us with one another, but with foreign nations; for these States, once divided, would connect themselves with foreign powers, which would profit by our jealousies, and involve our whole policy in inextricable confusion.

There are some among us who are unwilling to be connected with States sustaining so great a wrong as slavery. But if the North can be exempted from obligation to sustain it, we ought not to make its existence at the South a ground of separation. The doctrine, that intimate political connection is not to be maintained with men practising a great wrong, would lead to the dissolution of all government, and of civil society. Every nation, great or small, contains multitudes who practise wrongs, nor is it possible to exclude such from political power. Injustice, if not the ruling element in human affairs, has yet a fearful influence. In popular governments, the ambitious and intriguing often bear sway. Men who are ready to sacrifice quiet and domestic comfort, and all other interests, to political place and promotion, will snatch the prize from uncompromising, modest virtue. In our present low civilization, a community has no pledge of being governed by its virtue. In free governments, parties are the means of power, and a country can fall under few more immoral influences than party spirit. Without a deep moral revolution in society, we must continue to be ruled very imperfectly. In truth, among the darkest mysteries of Providence, are the crimes and woes flowing from the organization of men into states, from our subjection to human rule. The very vices of men, which make government needful, unfit them to govern. Government is only to be endured on account of the greater evils of anarchy which it prevents. It is no sufficient reason, then, for breaking from the Slave-holding States, that they practise a great wrong.

Besides, are not the purposes of Providence often accomplished by the association of the good with the

comparatively bad? Is the evil man, or the evil community to be excluded from brotherly feeling, to be treated as an outcast by the more innocent? Would not this argue a want of faith and love, rather than a just abhorrence of wrong? Undoubtedly the good are to free themselves from participation in crime; but they are not therefore to sever human ties, or renounce the means of moral influence.

With whom can we associate, if we will have no fellowship with wrong-doing? Can a new confederacy be formed, which will exclude selfishness, jealousy, intrigue? Do not all confederacies provoke among their members keen competitions for power, and induce unjust means of securing it? On the whole, has not our present Union been singularly free from the collisions which naturally spring from such close political connection? Would a smaller number of States be more likely to agree? Do we not owe to the extent of the Union the singular fact, that no State has inspired jealousy by disproportionate influence or power?

The South, indeed, is wedded to an unjust institution. But the South is not, therefore, another name for injustice. Slave-holding is not the only relation of its inhabitants. They are bound together by the various and most interesting ties of life. They are parents and children, husbands and wives, friends, neighbours, members of the State, members of the Christian body; and in all these relations there may be found models of purity and virtue. How many among ourselves, who must at any rate form part of a political body, and fill the highest places in the State, fall short of multitudes at the South, in moral and religious principle!

Form what confederacy we may, it will often pledge

us to the wrong side. Its powers will often be perverted. The majority will be seduced again and again into crime; and incorruptible men, politically weak, will be compelled to content themselves with what will seem wasted remonstrance. No Paradise opens itself, if we leave our Union with the corrupt South. A corrupt North will be leagued together, to act out the evil, as well as the good, which is at work in its members. A mournful amount of moral evil is to be found through this part of the country. The spirit of commerce, which is the spirit of the North, has lately revealed the tendencies to guilt which it involves. We are taught, that, however covered up with the name of honour, however restrained by considerations of reputation and policy, trade may undermine integrity, to an extent which shakes the confidence of the unthinking in all human virtue.

The fiery passions which have broken out at the South, since the agitation of the slavery question, have alienated many among us from that part of the country. But these prove no singular perverseness or corruption. What else could have been expected? Was it to be imagined that a proud, fiery people, could hear patiently one of their oldest and most rooted institutions set down among the greatest wrongs and oppressions? that men, holding the highest rank, would consent to bear the reproach of trampling right and humanity in the dust? Do men at the North, good or bad, abandon without a struggle advantages confirmed to them by long prescription? Do they easily relinquish gainful vocations, on which the moral sentiment of the community begins to frown? Is it easy to bring down the exalted from the chief seats in society? to overcome the pride of caste?

to disarm the prejudices of a sect? Is human nature among ourselves easily dispossessed of early prepossessions, and open to rebuke? That the South should react with violence against anti-slavery doctrines was the most natural thing in the world; and the very persons, whose consciences were the most reconciled to the evil, who least suspected wrong in the institution, were likely to feel themselves most aggrieved. The exasperated jealousies of the South in regard to the North, are such as spring up universally towards communities of different habits, principles, and feelings, which have got the start of their neighbours, and take the liberty to reprove them. Allow the South to be passionate. Passion is not the worst vice on the earth, nor are a fiery people the greatest offenders. Such evils are not the most enduring. Conflagrations in communities, as in the forest, die out sooner or later.

Perhaps we have not felt enough, how tender are the points which the anti-slavery movement has touched at the South. The slave is property, and to how many men everywhere is property dearer than life? Nor is this all. The slave is not only the object of cupidity, but of a stronger passion, the passion for power. The slave-holder is not only an owner, but a master. He rules, he wields an absolute sceptre; and when have men yielded empire without conflict? Would the North make such a sacrifice more cheerfully than the South?

To judge justly of the violence of the South, another consideration must not be overlooked. It must be acknowledged that abundant fuel has been ministered to the passions of the slave-holder, by the vehemence with which his domestic institutions were assailed at the

North. No deference was paid to his sensitiveness, his dignity. The newly awakened sympathy with the slave not only denied the rights, but set at nought all the feelings of the master. That a gentle or more courteous approach would have softened him is not said; but that the whole truth might have been spoken in tones less offensive, cannot be questioned; so that we, who have opposed slavery, are responsible in part for the violence which has offended us.

No, the spirit of the South furnishes no argument for dissolving the Union. That states less prosperous than ourselves should be jealous of movements directed from this quarter against their institutions is not strange. We must imagine ourselves in the position of the South, to judge of the severity of the trial. We must not forget that to the multitude there, slavery seems, if not right in itself, yet an irremediable evil. They look at it in the light of habit, and of opinions which prevailed in times of darkness and despotism. With such prepossessions, how could they but repel the zeal of Northern reformers?

It seems to be thought by some that the diversities of character between the South and North unfit them for political union. That diversities exist, it is true; but they are such as by mutual action and modification may ultimately form a greater people. It is by the fusion of various attributes that rich and noble characters are formed. The different sections of our country need to be modified by one another's influence. The South is ardent; the North calmer and more foreseeing. The South has quicker sympathies; the North does more good. The South commits the individual more to his own arm of defence; at the North the idea of law has

greater sanctity. The South has a freer and more graceful bearing, and a higher aptitude for genial social intercourse; the North has its compensation in superior domestic virtues and enjoyments. The courage of the South is more impetuous; of the North more stubborn. The South has more of the self-glorifying spirit of the French; the North, like England, is at once too proud and too diffident to boast. We of the North are a more awkward, shy, stiff, and steady race, with a liberal intermixture of enthusiasm, enterprise, reflection, and quiet heroism; while the South is franker, bolder, more fervent, more brilliant, and of course more attractive to strangers, and more fitted for social influence.

Such comparisons must, indeed, be made with large allowances. The exceptions to the common character are numerous at the North and the South, and the shades of distinction are growing fainter. But climate, that mysterious agent on the spirit, will never suffer these diversities wholly to disappear; nor is it best that they should be lost. A nation with these different elements will have a richer history, and is more likely to adopt a wise and liberal policy, that will do justice to our whole nature. The diversities between the two sections of the community are inducements rather than objections to union; for narrow and homogeneous communities are apt to injure and degrade themselves by stubborn prejudices and by a short-sighted selfish concern for their special interests; and it is well for them to form connections, which will help or force them to look far and wide, to make compromises and sacrifices, and to seek a larger good.

We have a strong argument for continued union in the almost insuperable difficulties which would follow

its dissolution. To the young and inexperienced, the formation of new confederacies and new governments passes for an easy task. It seems to be thought, that a political union may be got up as easily as a marriage. But love is the magician, which levels all the mountains of difficulty in the latter case; and no love, too often nothing but selfishness, acts in the former.

Let the union be dissolved, and new federal governments must be framed; and we have little reason to anticipate better than we now enjoy. Not that our present Constitution is what it is sometimes called, the perfection of political skill. It is the first experiment of a purely representative system; and first experiments are almost necessarily imperfect. Future ages may smile at our blameless model of government. A more skilful machinery, more effectual checks, wiser distributions and modifications of power, are probably to be taught the world by our experience. But our experience has as yet been too short to bring us this wisdom, whilst the circumstances of the present moment are anything but propitious to an improvement on the work of our fathers.

The work of framing a government, even in favourable circumstances, is one of the most arduous committed to man. The construction of the simplest form of polity, or of institutions for a single community in rude stages of society, demands rare wisdom; and accordingly the renown of legislators transcends all other fame in history. But to construct a government for a confederacy of States, of nations, in a highly complex and artificial state of society, is an Herculean task. The Federal Constitution was a higher achievement than the assertion of our independence in the

field of battle. If we can point to any portion of our history, as indicating a special divine Providence, it was the consent of so many communities to a frame of government, combining such provisions for human rights and happiness as we now enjoy.

Break up this union, reduce these States, now doubled in number, to a fragmentary form, and who can hope to live long enough to see an harmonious re-construction of them into new confederacies? We know how the present Constitution was obstructed by the jealousies and passions of states and individuals. But if these were so formidable at the end of a struggle against a common foe, which had knit all hearts, what is not to be dreaded from the distrusts which must follow the conflicts and exasperations of the last fifty years, and the agony of separation? It is no reproach on the people to say, that nearly fifty years of peace, and trade, and ambition, and prosperity, have not nourished as ardent a patriotism as the revolutionary struggle; for this is a necessary result of the principles of human nature. We should come to our work more selfishly than our fathers approached theirs. Our interests too are now more complicated, various, interfering, so that a compromise would be harder. We have lost much of the simplicity of a former time, and our public men are greater proficients in intrigue. Were there natural divisions of the country, which would determine at once the new arrangements of power, the difficulty would be less; but the new confederacies would be sufficiently arbitrary to open a wide field to selfish plotters. Who that knows the obstacles which passion, selfishness, and corruption throw in the way of a settled government, will desire to encounter the chances and perils of constructing a new system under all these disadvantages?

There is another circumstance which renders it undesirable now to break up the present order of things. The minds of men everywhere are at this moment more than usually unsettled. There is much questioning of the past and the established, and a disposition to push principles to extremes, without regard to the modifications which other principles and a large experience demand. There is a blind confidence in the power of man's will and wisdom over society, an overweening faith in legislation, a disposition to look to outward arrangements for that melioration of human affairs which can come only from the culture and progress of the soul, a hope of making by machinery what is and must be a slow, silent growth. Such a time is not the best for constructing governments and new confederacies.

We are especially passing through a stage of political speculation, or opinion, which is, indeed, necessary under such institutions, and which may be expected to give place to higher wisdom, but which is not the most propitious for the formation of political institutions. I refer to false notions as to democracy, and as to its distinctive benefits; notions which ought not to surprise us, because a people are slow to learn the true character and spirit of their institutions, and generally acquire this, as all other knowledge, by some painful experience. It is a common notion here, as elsewhere, that it is a grand privilege to govern, to exercise political power; and that popular institutions have this special benefit, that they confer the honour and pleasure of sovereignty on the greatest number possible. The people are pleased at the thoughts of being rulers; and hence all obstructions to their immediate, palpable ruling are regarded with jealousy. It is a grand thing,

they fancy, to have their share of kingship. Now this is wrong, a pernicious error. It is no privilege to govern, but a fearful responsibility, and seldom assumed without guilt. The great good to be sought and hoped from popular institutions is, to be freed from unnecessary rule, to be governed with no reference to the glory or gratification of the sovereign power. The grand good of popular institutions is Liberty, or the protection of every man's rights to the full, with the least possible restraint. Sovereignty, wherever lodged, is not a thing to be proud of, or to be stretched a hand's-breadth beyond need. If I am to be hedged in on every side, to be fretted by the perpetual presence of arbitrary will, to be denied the exercise of my powers, it matters nothing to me whether the chain is laid on me by one or many, by king or people. A despot is not more tolerable for his many heads.

Democracy, considered in itself, is the noblest form of government, and the only one to satisfy a man who respects himself and his fellow-creatures. But if its actual operation be regarded, we are compelled to say that it works very imperfectly, It is true of people, as it is of king and nobles, that they have no great capacity of government. They ought not to exult at the thought of being rulers, but to content themselves with swaying the sceptre within as narrow limits as the public safety may require. They should tremble at this function of government, should exercise it with self-distrust, and be humbled by the defects of their administration.

I am not impatient of law. One law I reverence; that divine eternal law written on the rational soul, and revealed with a celestial brightness in the word and life

of Jesus Christ. But human rulers, be they many or few, are apt to pay little heed to this law. They do not easily surrender to it their interests and ambition. It is dethroned in cabinets, and put to silence in halls of legislation. In the sphere of politics, even men, generally good, dispense unscrupulously with a pure morality, and of consequence we all have an interest in the limitation of political power.

Such views teach us, that one of the first lessons to be taught to a people in a democracy, is self-distrust. They should learn, that to rule is the most difficult work on earth; that in all ages and countries men have sunk under the temptations and difficulties of the task; that no power is so corrupting as public power, and that none should be used with greater fear.

By democracy we understand, that a people governs itself; and the primary, fundamental act required of a people is, that it shall lay such restraints on its own powers, as will give the best security against their abuse. This is the highest purpose of a popular constitution. A constitution is not merely a machinery for ascertaining and expressing a people's will, but much more a provision for keeping that will within righteous bounds. It is the act of a people imposing limits on itself, setting guard on its own passions, and throwing obstructions in the way of legislation, so as to compel itself to pause, to deliberate, to hear all remonstrances, to weigh all rights and interests, before it acts. A constitution not framed on these principles, must fail of its end. Now at the present moment, these sound maxims have lost much of their authority. The people, flattered into blindness, have forgotten their passionateness, and proneness to abuse power.

The wholesome restraints laid by the present Constitution on popular impulse are losing their force, and we have reason to fear that new constitutions formed at the present moment would want, more than our present national charter, the checks and balances on which safety depends.

A wise man knows himself to be weak, and lays down rules of life which meet his peculiar temptation. So should a people do. A people is in danger from fickleness and passion. The great evil to be feared in a popular government is instability, or the sacrifice of great principles to momentary impulses. A constitution which does not apply checks and restraints to these perils cannot stand. Our present Constitution has many wise provisions of this character. The division of the legislature into two branches, and the forms which retard legislation, are of great value. But what constitutes the peculiar advantage of the distinction of legislative chambers, is, that the Senate has so different a character from the House of Representatives; that it represents states, not individuals; that it is chosen by legislatures, not by primary assemblies; and that the term of a senator's service is three times the length of that of the popular branch. The Senate is one of the chief conservative powers in the government. It has two grand functions. One to watch the rights of the several States, and the other, not less important, to resist the fluctuations of the popular branch. The Senate is a power raised for a time by the people above their own passions, that it may secure stability to the administration of affairs. Now this function of the Senate has been seriously impaired by the doctrine of "Instructions," a doctrine destroying moral indepen-

dence, and making the senator a passive recipient of momentary impulses which it may be his highest duty to withstand. This doctrine is in every view hurtful. A man in public life should as far as possible be placed under influences which give him dignity of mind, self-respect, and a deep feeling of responsibility. He should go to the nation's council with a mind open to all the light which is concentrated there, to study and promote the broad interests of the nation. He is not to work as a mere tool, to be an echo of the varying voices at a distance, but to do what seems to him right, and to answer to his constituents for his conduct, at the appointed hour for yielding up his trust. Yet were new institutions to be framed at this moment, would not the people forget the restraint which they should impose on themselves, and the respect due to their delegates; and from attaching a foolish self-importance to the act of governing, would they not give to their momentary feelings more and more the conduct of public affairs?

The Constitution contains another provision of wise self-distrust on the part of the people, in the power of the veto entrusted to the President. The President is the only representative of the people's unity. He is the head of the nation. He has nothing to do with districts or states, but to look with an equal eye on the whole country. To him is entrusted a limited negative on the two chambers, a negative not simply designed to guard his own power from encroachment, but to correct partial legislation, and to be a barrier against invasions of the Constitution by extensive combinations of interest or ambition. Every department should be a check on legislation; but this salutary power there is a

disposition to wrest from the Executive, and it would hardly find a place in a new confederacy.

The grand restraining, conservative power of the State remains to be mentioned; it is the Judiciary. This is worth more to the people than any other department. The impartial administration of a good code of laws is the grand result, the paramount good, to which all political arrangements should be subordinate. The reign of justice, which is the reign of rights and liberty, is the great boon we should ask from the State. The judicial is the highest function. The Chief Justice should rank before King or President. The pomp of a palace may be dispensed with; but every imposing solemnity, consistent with the simplicity of our manners, should be combined in the hall where the laws, which secure every man's rights, are administered. To accomplish the great end of government, nothing is so important as to secure the impartiality and moral independence of judges; and for this end they should be appointed for life, subject to removal only for violation of duty. This is essential. A judge should not hang on the smiles of king or people. In him the people should erect a power above their own temporary will. There ought to be in the State something to represent the majesty of that stable, everlasting law to which all alike should bow; some power above the sordid interests, and aloof from the struggles and intrigues of ordinary public life. The dependence of the judge on the breath of party, or the fleeting passions of the people, is a deformity in the State, for which no other excellence in popular institutions can make compensation. The grandest spectacle in this country is the Judiciary power, raised by the people to indepen-

dence of parties and temporary majorities, taking as its first guide the national charter, the fundamental law, which no parties can touch, which stands like a rock amidst the fluctuations of opinion, and determining by this the validity of the laws enacted by transient legislatures. Here is the conservative element of the country. Yet it is seriously proposed to destroy the independence of the judiciary power, to make the judge a pensioner on party, by making the office elective for a limited time; and it is not impossible that this pernicious feature might be impressed on new institutions, which might spring up at the present time.

This language will not win me the name of Democrat. But I am not anxious to bear any name, into which Government enters as the great idea. I want as little government as consists with safety to the rights of all. I wish the people to govern no farther than they must. I wish them to place all checks on the legislature which consist with its efficiency. I honour the passion for power and rule as little in the people as in a king. It is a vicious principle, exist where it may. If by democracy be meant the exercise of sovereignty by the people under all those provisions and self-imposed restraints, which tend most to secure equal laws, and the rights of each and all, then I shall be proud to bear its name. But the unfettered multitude is not dearer to me than the unfettered king. And yet, at the present moment, there is a tendency to remove the restraints on which the wise and righteous exertion of the people's power depends.

The sum of what I have wished to say is, that the Union of these States should, if possible, be kept inviolate, on the ground of the immense difficulty of con-

structing new confederacies and new governments. The present state of men's minds is not favourable to this most arduous task. Other considerations might be urged against disunion. But in all this, I do not mean that union is to be held fast at whatever cost. Vast sacrifices should be made to it, but not the sacrifice of duty. For one, I do not wish it to continue, if after earnest, faithful effort, the truth should be made clear, that the Free States are not to be absolved from giving support to slavery. Better that we should part, than be the police of the slave-holder, than fight his battles, than wage war to uphold an oppressive institution.

So I say, let the Union be dissevered rather than receive Texas into the confederacy. This measure, besides entailing on us evils of all sorts, would have for its chief end, to bring the whole country under the slave-power, to make the General Government the agent of slavery; and this we are bound to resist at all hazards. The Free States should declare that the very act of admitting Texas will be construed as a dissolution of the Union.

This act would be unconstitutional. The authors of the Constitution never dreamed of conferring a power on Congress to attach a foreign nation to the country, and so to destroy entirely the original balance of power. It is true, that the people acquiesced in the admission of Louisiana to the Union by treaty; but the necessity of the case reconciled them to that dangerous precedent. It was understood, that by fair means or foul, by negotiation or war, the Western States *would* and *must* possess themselves of the Mississippi and New Orleans. This was regarded as a matter of life or death; and, therefore, the people allowed this great in-

road to take place in the fundamental conditions of the Union, without the appeal which ought to have been made to the several State sovereignties. But no such necessity now exists, and a like action of Congress ought to be repelled as gross usurpation.

We are always in danger of excessive jealousy in judging of the motives of other parts of the country, and this remark may apply to the present case. The South, if true to its own interest, would see in Texas a rival rather than an ally; but at the North it is suspected, that political motives outweigh the economical. It is suspected, that the desire of annexing Texas has been whetted by the disclosures of the last census as to the increase of population and wealth at the North. The South, it is said, means to balance the Free States by adding a new empire to the confederacy. But on this point our slave-holding brethren need not be anxious. Without Texas, the South will have very much its own way, and will continue to exert a disproportionate influence over public affairs. It has within itself elements of political power more efficient than ours. The South has abler politicians, and almost necessarily, because its most opulent class make politics the business of life. The North may send wiser statesmen to Congress, but not men to marshal and govern parties, not political leaders. The South surpasses us, not in true eloquence, which is little known anywhere, but in prompt, bold speech, a superiority due not only to greater ardour of feeling, but to a state of society encouraging the habit, and stimulating by constant action the faculty of free and strong utterance on political subjects; and such eloquence is no mean power in popular bodies. The South has a bolder and more un-

scrupulous character, for which the caution and prudence of the North are not a match. Once more, it has union, common feeling, a peculiar bond in slavery, to which the divided North can make no adequate opposition. At the North, politics occupy a second place in men's minds. Even in what we call seasons of public excitement, the people think more of private business than of public affairs. We think more of property than of political power; and this, indeed, is the natural result of free institutions. Under these, political power is not suffered to accumulate in a few hands, but is distributed in minute portions; and even when thus limited, it is not permitted to endure, but passes in quick rotation from man to man. Of consequence, it is an inferior good to property. Every wise man among us looks on property as a more sure and lasting possession to himself and his family, as conferring more ability to do good, to gratify generous and refined tastes, than the possession of political power. In the South, an unnatural state of things turns men's thoughts to political ascendancy; but in the Free States men think little of it. Property is the good for which they toil perseveringly from morning to night. Even the political partisan among us has an eye to property, and seeks office as the best, perhaps only way of subsistence. In this state of things, the South has little to fear from the North. For one thing we may contend, that is, for a tariff, for protection to our monied interests; but if we may be left to work and thrive, we shall not quarrel for power.

The little sensibility at the North to the present movements on the subject of Texas is the best commentary on the spirit of the Free States. That the South

should be suffered to think for a moment of adding a great country to the United States for the sake of strengthening slavery, demonstrates an absence of wise political jealousy at the North, to which no parallel can be found in human history.

The union of Texas to us must be an unmixed evil. We do not need it on a single account. We are already too large. The machine of government hardly creeps on under the weight of so many diverse interests, and such complex functions as burden it now. Our own natural increase is already too rapid. New states are springing up too fast; for in these there must exist, from the nature of the case, an excess of adventurous, daring spirits, whose influence over the government cannot but be perilous for a time; and it is madness to add to us a new nation to increase the wild impulses, the half-civilised forces, which now mingle with our national legislation.

To unite with Texas, would be to identify ourselves with a mighty wrong; for such was the seizure of that province by a horde of adventurers. It would be to ensure the predominance of the slave-power, to make slavery a chief national interest, and to pledge us to the continually increasing prostitution of the national power to its support. It would be to begin a career of encroachment on Mexico, which would corrupt and dishonour us, would complicate and disturb the movements of government, would create a wasteful patronage, and enlarge our military establishments. It would be to plunge us into war, not only with Mexico, but with foreign powers, which will not quietly leave us to add the Gulf of Mexico to our vast stretch of territory along the Atlantic coast.

To unite Texas to ourselves, would be to destroy our present unity as a people, to sow new seeds of jealousy. It would be to spread beyond bounds the space over which the national arm must be extended; to present new points of attack and new reasons for assault, and at the same time to impair the energy to resist them. Can the Free States consent to pour out their treasure and blood like water, in order to defend against Mexico and her European protectors the slave-trodden fields of distant Texas? Would the South be prompt to exhaust itself for the annexation to this country of the vast British possessions of the North? Is it ready to pledge itself to carry the "star-spangled banner" to the pole, in exchange for our readiness to carry slavery to Darien? There must be some fixed limits to our country. We at the North do not ask for Canada. We would not, I hope, accept it as a gift; for we could not rule it well. And is the country to spread itself in one direction alone? Are we willing to place ourselves under the rule of adventurers, whom a restless spirit or a dread of justice drives to Texas? What possible boon can we gain? The Free States are not only wanting in common wisdom, but in those instincts by which other communities shrink from connections that diminish their importance and neutralise their power. We shall deserve to be put under guardianship, if we receive Texas to our embrace. Such suicidal policy would place us among those whom "God infatuates before he destroys."

I have now spoken of the National Union, and of the danger to which it is exposed. The duty of the Free States is to keep their attachment to it unimpaired by local partialities, jealousies and dislikes, by

supposed inequalities of benefits or burdens, or by the want of self-restraint manifested in the other part of the country. They cannot, however, but see and feel one immense deduction from its blessings. They are bound by it to give a degree of sanction and support to slavery, and are threatened with the annexation of another country to our own, for the purpose of strengthening this institution. Their duty is to insist on release from all obligations, and on security against all connections, which do or may require them to uphold a system which they condemn. No blessings of the Union can be a compensation for taking part in the enslaving of our fellow-creatures; nor ought this bond to be perpetuated, if experience shall demonstrate, that it can only continue through our participation in wrong-doing. To this conviction the Free States are tending; and in this view their present subserviency to the interests of slavery is more endurable.

I proceed, in the last place, to offer a few remarks on the duties of the Free States as to a subject of infinite importance, the subject of War. To add to the distresses of the country, a war-cry is raised; and a person, unaccustomed to the recklessness with which the passions of the moment break out among us in conversation and the newspapers, would imagine that we were on the brink of a conflict with the most powerful nation on earth. That we are indeed to fight, cannot easily be believed. That two nations, of a common origin, having so many common interests, united by so many bonds, speaking one language, breathing the same free spirit, holding the same faith, to whom war can bring no good, and on whom it must inflict terrible

evils; that such nations should expose themselves and the civilised world to the chances, crimes, and miseries of war, for the settlement of questions which may be adjusted honourably and speedily by arbitration; this implies such an absence of common sense, as well as of moral and religious principle, that, bad as the world is, one can hardly believe, without actual vision, that such a result can take place. Yet the history of the world, made up of war, teaches us that we may be too secure; and no excitement of warlike feeling should pass without a word of warning.

In speaking of our duties on this subject, I can use but one language, that of Christianity. I do believe that Christianity was meant to be a law for society, meant to act on nations; and however I may be smiled at for my ignorance of men and things, I can propose no standard of action to individuals or communities, but the law of Christ; the law of Eternal Rectitude; the law not only of this nation, but of all worlds.

The great duty of God's children is, to love one another. This duty on earth takes the name and form of the law of humanity. We are to recognise all men as brethren, no matter where born, or under what sky, or institution, or religion, they may live. Every man belongs to the race, and owes a duty to mankind. Every nation belongs to the family of nations, and is to desire the good of all. Nations are to love one another. It is true, that they usually adopt towards one another principles of undisguised selfishness, and glory in successful violence or fraud. But the great law of humanity is unrepealed. Men cannot vote this out of the universe by acclamation. The Christian precepts, "Do to others as you would they should do to you;

Love your neighbour as yourselves; Love your enemies;" apply to nations as well as individuals. A nation, renouncing them, is a Heathen, not a Christian nation. Men cannot, by combining themselves into narrower or larger societies, sever the sacred, blessed bond, which joins them to their kind. An evil nation, like an evil man, may indeed be withstood, but not in hatred and revenge. The law of humanity must reign over the assertion of all human rights. The vindictive, unforgiving spirit which prevails in the earth, must yield to the mild, impartial spirit of Jesus Christ.

I know that these principles will receive little hearty assent. Multitudes, who profess to believe in Christ, have no faith in the efficacy of his spirit, or in the accomplishment of that regenerating work which he came to accomplish. There is a worse scepticism than what passes under the name of infidelity, a scepticism as to the reality and the power of moral and Christian truth; and accordingly, a man, who calls on a nation to love the great family of which it is a part, to desire the weal and the progress of the race, to blend its own interests with the interests of all, to wish well to its foes, must pass for a visionary, perhaps in war would be called a traitor. The first teacher of Universal Love was nailed to the cross for withstanding the national spirit, hopes, and prejudices of Judea. His followers, in these better days, escape with silent derision or neglect.

It is a painful thought, that our relations to foreign countries are determined chiefly by men who are signally wanting in reverence for the law of Christ, the law of humanity. Should we repair to the seat of government, and listen to the debates of Congress, we

should learn that the ascendant influence belongs to men who have no comprehension of the mild and generous spirit of our religion; who exult in what they are pleased to call a quick sense of honour, which means a promptness to resent, and a spirit of vengeance. And shall Christians imbrue their hands in the blood of their brethren, at the bidding of such men?

At this moment, our chief exposure to war arises from sensibility to what is called the honour of the nation. A nation cannot, indeed, be too jealous of its honour. But, unhappily, few communities know what this means. There is but one true honour for men or nations. This consists in impartial justice and generosity; in acting up fearlessly to a high standard of Right. The multitude of men place it chiefly in courage; and in this, as in all popular delusions, there is a glimpse of truth. Courage is an essential element of true honour. A nation or an individual without it, is nothing worth. Almost any thing is better than a craven spirit. Better be slaughtered, than be cowardly and tame. What is the teaching of Christianity, but that we must be ready at any moment to lay down life for truth, humanity, and virtue? All the virtues are naturally brave. The just and disinterested man dreads nothing that man can do to him. But courage standing alone, animal courage, the courage of the robber, pirate, or duellist, this has no honour. This only proves, that bad passions are strong enough to conquer the passion of fear. Yet this low courage is that of which nations chiefly boast, and in which they make their honour to consist.

Were the spirit of justice and humanity to pervade this country, we could not be easily driven into war.

England and Mexico, the countries with which we are in danger of being embroiled, have an interest in peace. The questions on which we are at issue, touch no vital point, no essential interest or right, which we may not put to hazard; and consequently they are such as may and ought to be left to arbitration.

There has of late been a cry of war with Mexico; and yet, if the facts are correctly stated in the papers, a more unjust war cannot be conceived. It seems that a band of Texans entered the territory of Mexico, during a state of war between the two countries. They entered it armed. They were met and conquered by a Mexican force; and certain American citizens, found in the number, were seized and treated as prisoners of war. This is pronounced an injury which the nation is bound to resent. We are told that the band, in which the Americans were found, was engaged in a trading, not a military expedition. Such a statement is of course very suspicious; but allow it to be true. Must not the entrance of an armed band from one belligerent country into the other, be regarded as a hostile invasion? Must not a citizen of a neutral state, if found in this armed company, be considered as a party to the invasion? Has he not, with eyes open, engaged in an exhibition which cannot but be regarded as an act of war. That our nation should demand the restoration of such a person as a right, which must not be denied without the hazard of a war, would seem to show that we have studied international law in a new edition, revised and corrected for our special benefit. It is the weakness of Mexico, which encourages these freedoms on our part. Yet their weakness is a claim on compassion. We ought to look on that distracted country as

an older brother on a wayward child, and should blush to make our strength a ground for aggression.

There is another ground, we are told, for war with Mexico. She has treated our citizens cruelly, as well as made them prisoners of war. She has condemned them to ignominious labour in the streets. This is not unlikely. Mexico sets up no pretension to signal humanity, nor has it been fostered by her history. Perhaps, however, she is only following, with some exaggerations, the example of Texas; for, after the great victory of San Jacinto, we were told that the Texans set their prisoners to work. At the worst, here is no cause for war. If an American choose to take part in the hostile movements of another nation, he must share the fate of its citizens. If Mexico indeed practises cruelties towards her prisoners, of whatever country, we are bound by the law of humanity to remonstrate against them; but we must not fight to reform her. The truth however is, that we can place no great reliance on what we hear of Mexican cruelty. The press of Texas and the South, in its anxiety to involve us in war with that country, does not speak under oath. In truth, no part of our country seems to think of Mexico as having the rights of a sovereign State. We hear the politician, in high places, exhorting us to take part in raising "the single Star of Texas" above the city of Montezuma, and to gorge ourselves with the plunder of her churches; and we see armed bands from the South hurrying in time of peace towards that devoted land, to realise these dreams of unprincipled cupidity. That Mexico is more sinned against than sinning; that she is as just as her foes, one can hardly help believing.

We proceed to consider our difficulties with Great

Britain, which are numerous enough to alarm us, but which are all of a character to admit arbitration. The first is the North-east boundary question. This, indeed, may be said to be settled in the minds of the people. As a people, we have no doubt that the letter of the treaty marks out the line on which we insist. The great majority also believe, that England insists on another, not from respect for the stipulations of the treaty, but because she needs it to secure a communication between her various provinces. The land then is legally ours, and ought not to be surrendered to any force. But in this, as in other cases, we are bound by the law of humanity to look beyond the letter of stipulations, to inquire not for legal but for moral right, and to act up to the principles of an enlarged justice and benevolence. The territory claimed by England is of great importance to her, of none comparatively to us; and we know, that, when the treaty was framed, no thought existed on either side of carrying the line so far to the North as to obstruct the free and safe communication between her provinces. The country was then unexplored. The precise effect of the stipulation could not be foreseen. It was intended to secure a boundary advantageous to both parties. Under these circumstances, the law of equity and humanity demands that Great Britain be put in possession of the territory needed to connect her provinces together. Had nations risen at all to the idea of generosity in their mutual dealings, this country might be advised to present to England the land she needs. But prudence will stop at the suggestion, that we ought to offer it to her on terms which impartial men may pronounce just. And in doing this, we should not merely consult equity and

honour, but our best interest. It is the interest of a nation to establish, on all sides, boundaries which will be satisfactory alike to itself and its neighbours. This is almost essential to enduring peace. Wars have been waged without number, for the purpose of uniting the scattered provinces of a country, of giving it compactness, unity, and the means of communication. A nation prizing peace should remove the irritations growing out of unnatural boundaries; and this we can do in the present case without a sacrifice.

According to these views, one of the most unwise measures ever adopted in this country, was the rejection of the award of the King of the Netherlands. A better award could not have been given. It ceded for us what a wise policy teaches us to surrender, gave us a natural boundary, and gave us compensation for the territory to be surrendered. If now some friendly power would by its mediation effectually recommend to the two countries this award as the true interest of both, it would render signal service to justice and humanity.

Still it is true that the territory that we claim is ours. The bargain made by England was a hard one; but an honest man does not on this account shrink from his contract; nor can England lay hands on what she unwisely surrendered, without breach of faith, without committing herself to an unrighteous war.

A way of compromise in a case like this is not difficult to honest and friendly nations. For example, let impartial and intelligent commissioners, agreed to by both countries, repair to the disputed territory with the treaty in their hands, and with the surveys made by the two governments; and let them go with full authority to determine the line which the treaty prescribes, to

draw another line, if such shall seem to them required by principles of equity, or by the true interests of both countries, and to make ample compensation to the nation which shall relinquish part of its territory. It is believed that, generally speaking, men of distinguished honour, integrity, and ability, would execute a trust of this nature more wisely, impartially, and speedily, than a third government, and that the employment of such would facilitate the extension of arbitration to a greater variety of cases than can easily be comprehended under the present system. I have suggested one mode of compromise. Others and better may be devised, if the parties will approach the difficulty in a spirit of peace.

The case of the Caroline next presents itself. In this case our territory was undoubtedly violated by England. But the question arises, whether nothing justified or mitigated the violation. According to the law of nations, when a government is unable to restrain its subjects from continued acts of hostility towards a neighbouring State, this State is authorised to take the defence of its rights into its own hands, and may enter the territory of the former power with such a force as may be required to secure itself against aggression. The question is, did such a state of things exist on the Canadian frontier? That we Americans, if placed in the condition of the English, would have done as they did, admits little doubt. This, indeed, is no justification of the act; for both nations in this condition would act more from impulse than reason. But it shows us, that the question is a complicated one; such a question as even well-disposed nations cannot easily settle by negotiation, and which may and ought to be committed to an impartial umpire.

I will advert to one more difficulty between this country and England, which is intimately connected with the subject of this Tract. I refer to the question, whether England may visit our vessels to ascertain their nationality, in cases where the American flag is suspected of being used by foreigners for the prosecution of the slave-trade. On this subject we have two duties to perform. One is, to protect our commerce against claims on the part of other nations, which may silently be extended, and may expose it to interference and hinderance, injurious alike to our honour and prosperity. The other, not less clear and urgent, is to afford effectual assistance to the great struggle of European nations for the suppression of the slave-trade, and especially to prevent our flag from being made a cover for the nefarious traffic. These are two duties which we can and must reconcile. We must not say, that the slave-trade is to be left to itself, and that we have no obligation to take part in its abolition. We cannot without shame and guilt stand neutral in this war. The slave-trade is an enormous crime, a terrible outrage on humanity, an accumulation of unparalleled wrongs and woes, and the civilised world is waking up to bring it to an end. Every nation is bound by the law of humanity, to give its sympathies, prayers, and co-operation to this work. Even had our commerce no connection with this matter, we should be bound to lend a helping hand to the cause of the human race. But the fact is, that the flag of our country, prostituted by infamous foreigners, is a principal shelter to the slave-trade. Vile men wrap themselves up in our garments, and in this guise go forth to the work of robbery and murder. Shall we suffer this? Shall the

nations of the earth, when about so seize these outlaws, be forbidden to touch them, because they wear the American garb? It is said, indeed, that foreign powers, if allowed to visit our vessels for such a purpose, will lay hands on our own citizens, and invade our commercial rights. But vague suspicions of this kind do not annul a plain obligation. Uncertain consequences do not set aside what we know; and one thing we know, that the slave-trade ought not to be left to live and grow under the American flag. We are bound some way or other to stay this evil. We ought to say to Europe: "We detest this trade as much as you. We will join heart and hand in its destruction. We will assent to the mutual visitation which you plead for, if arrangements can be made to secure it against abuse. We will make sacrifices for this end. We will shrink from no reasonable concession. Your efforts shall not be frustrated by the prostitution of our flag." If in good faith we follow up these words, it can hardly be doubted that a safe and honourable arrangement may be made with foreign powers.

Some of our politicians protest vehemently against the visitation of vessels bearing our flag, for the purpose of determining their right to assume it. They admit, that there are cases, such as suspicion of piracy, in which such visitation is authorised by the law of nations. But this right, they say, cannot be extended at pleasure, by the union of several nations in treaties or conventions, which can only be executed by visiting the vessels of other powers. This is undoubtedly true. Nations, by union for private advantage, have no right to subject the ships of other powers to inconvenience,

or to the possibility of molestation, in order to compass their purpose. But when several nations join together to extirpate a widely-extended and flagrant crime against the human race, to put down a public and most cruel wrong, they have a right to demand that their labours shall not be frustrated by the fraudulent assumption of the flags of foreign powers. Subjecting their own ships to visitation as a means of preventing this abuse of their flags, they are authorised to expect a like subjection from other States, on condition that they proffer every possible security against the abuse of the power. A state, in declining such visitation, virtually withdraws itself from the commonwealth of nations. Christian states may be said without any figure to form a commonwealth. They are bound together by a common faith, the first law of which is universal good will. They recognise mutual obligations. They are united by interchange of material and intellectual products. Through their common religion and literature, and their frequent intercourse, they have attained to many moral sympathies; and when by these any portion of them are united in the execution of justice against open, fearful crime, they have a right to the good wishes of all other states; and especially a right to be unobstructed by them in their efforts. In the present case, we have ourselves fixed the brand of piracy on the very crime which certain powers of Europe have joined to suppress. Ought we not to consent, that vessels bearing our flag, but falling under just suspicion of assuming it for the perpetration of this piracy, should be visited, according to stipulated forms, that their nationality may be judged? Have we any right, by denying this claim, to give to acknowledged, flagrant crime,

an aid and facility, under which it cannot but prevail? There seems no reason for apprehension that, in assenting to visitation, we shall expose ourselves to great wrongs. From the nature of the case, strict and simple rules of judgment may be laid down, and the responsibility of the visiting officers may be made so serious as to give a moral certainty of caution. Undoubtedly injuries may chance to be inflicted, as is the case in the exercise of the clearest rights; but the chance is so small, whilst the effects of refusing visitation are so fatal and so sure, that our country, should it resist the claim, will take the attitude of hostility to the human race, and will deserve to be cut off from the fellowship of the Christian world.

It is customary, I know, to meet these remarks by saying that the crusade of England against this traffic is a mere show of philanthropy; that she is serving only her own ends; and that there is consequently no obligation to co-operate with her. This language might be expected from the South, where almost universal ignorance prevails in regard to the anti-slavery efforts of England; but it does little honour to the North, where the means of knowledge are possessed. That England is blending private views with the suppression of the slave-trade is a thing to be expected; for states, like individuals, seldom act from unmixed motives. But when we see a nation for fifty years keeping in sight a great object of humanity; when we see this enterprise, beginning with the peaceful Quaker, adopted by Christians of other names, and thus spreading through and moving the whole population; when we see the reluctant government compelled by the swelling sensibility of the people to lend itself to the cause, and to forward

it by liberal expenditure and vast efforts on sea and land; can we help feeling that the moral sentiment of the nation is the basis and spring of this great and glorious effort? On this subject I may speak from knowledge. In England, many years ago, I met the patriarchs of the anti-slavery cause. I was present at a meeting of the abolition committee, a body which has won an imperishable name in history. I saw men and women, eminent for virtue and genius, who had abstained from the products of slave-labour to compel the government to suppress the traffic in men. If ever Christian benevolence wrought a triumph, it was in that struggle; and the efforts of the nation from that day to this have been hallowed by the same generous feeling. Alas! the triumphs of humanity are not so numerous that we can afford to part with this. History records but one example of a nation fighting the battle of the oppressed, with the sympathy, earnestness, and sacrifices of a generous individual; and we will not give up our faith in this. And now is our country prepared to throw itself in the way of these holy efforts? Shall our flag be stained with the infamy of defending the slave trade against the humanity of other countries? Better that it should disappear from the ocean, than be so profaned.

It must not be said, that the slave-trade cannot be annihilated. The prospect grows brighter. One of its chief marts, Cuba, is now closed. The ports of Brazil, we trust, will next be shut against it; and these measures on land, aided by well-concerted operations at sea, will do much to free the world from this traffic. It must not find its last shelter under the American flag. We must not talk of difficulties. Let the na-

tion's heart be opened to the cry of humanity, to the voice of religion, and difficulties will vanish. In every good work for the freedom and melioration of the world, we ought to bear our part. We ought to be found in the front rank of the war against that hideous traffic, which we first branded as piracy. God save us from suffering our flag to be spread as a screen between the felon, the pirate, the kidnapper, the murderer, and the ministers of justice, of humanity, sent forth to cut short his crimes.

We have thus considered the most important of our difficulties with Mexico and England, which have been thought to threaten war. With a spirit of justice and peace, it seems impossible that we should be involved in hostilities. The duties of the Free States, and of all the States, are plain. We should cherish a spirit of humanity towards all countries. We should resist the false notions of honour, the false pride, the vindictive feelings, which are easily excited by supposed injuries from foreign powers, and are apt to spread like a pestilence from breast to breast, till they burst forth at length in a fierce, uncontrollable passion for war.

I have now finished my task. I have considered the Duties of the Free States in relation to slavery, and to other subjects of great and immediate concern. In this discussion I have constantly spoken of Duties as more important than Interests; but these in the end will be found to agree. The energy by which men prosper, is fortified by nothing so much, as by the lofty spirit which scorns to prosper through abandonment of duty.

I have been called by the subjects here discussed, to speak much of the evils of the times and the dangers of

the country; and in treating of these, a writer is almost necessarily betrayed into what may seem a tone of despondence. His anxiety to save his country from crime or calamity leads him to use unconsciously a language of alarm, which may excite the apprehension of inevitable misery. But I would not infuse such fears. I do not sympathise with the desponding tone of the day. It may be, that there are fearful woes in store for this people; but there are many promises of good to give spring to hope and effort; and it is not wise to open our eyes and ears to ill omens alone. It is to be lamented, that men, who boast of courage in other trials, should shrink so weakly from public difficulties and dangers, and should spend in unmanly reproaches or complaints the strength which they ought to give to their country's safety. But this ought not to surprise us in the present case; for our lot, until of late, has been singularly prosperous, and great prosperity enfeebles men's spirits, and prepares them to despond when it shall have passed away. The country, we are told, is "ruined." What! the country ruined, when the mass of the population have hardly retrenched a luxury! We are indeed paying, and we ought to pay, the penalty of reckless extravagance, of wild and criminal speculation, of general abandonment to the passion for sudden and enormous gains. But how are we ruined? Is the kind, nourishing earth about to become a cruel step-mother? Or is the teeming soil of this magnificent country sinking beneath our feet? Is the ocean dried up? Are our cities and villages, our schools and churches, in ruins? Are the stout muscles, which have conquered sea and land, palsied? Are the earnings of past years dissipated, and the skill which gathered them

forgotten? I open my eyes on this ruined country, and I see around me fields fresh with verdure, and behold on all sides the intelligent countenance, the sinewy limb, the kindly look, the free and manly bearing, which indicate anything but a fallen people. Undoubtedly we have much cause to humble ourselves for the vices, which our recent prosperity warmed into being, or rather brought out from the depths of men's souls. But in the reprobation which these vices awaken, have we no proof that the fountain of moral life in the nation's heart is not exhausted? In the progress of temperance, of education, and of religious sensibility in our land, have we no proof, that there is among us an impulse towards improvement, which no temporary crime or calamity can overpower?

I shall be pointed undoubtedly to our political corruptions, to the inefficiency and party passions which dishonour our present Congress, and to the infamy brought on the country by breach of faith and gross dishonesty in other legislatures. In sight of this, an American must indeed "blush, and hang his head." Still it is true, and the truth should be told, that, in consequence of the long divorce between morality and politics, public men do not represent the character of the people; nor can we argue from profligacy in public affairs to a general want of private virtue. Besides, we all know, that it is through errors, sins, and sufferings, that the individual makes progress; and so does a people. A nation cannot learn to govern itself in a day. New institutions, conferring great power on a people, open a door to many and great abuses, from which nothing but the slow and painful discipline of experience can bring deliverance. After all, there is

a growing intelligence in this community; there is much domestic virtue; there is a deep working of Christianity; there is going on a struggle of higher truths with narrow traditions, and of a wider benevolence with social evils; there is a spirit of freedom, a recognition of the equal rights of men; there are profound impulses received from our history, from the virtues of our fathers, and especially from our revolutionary conflict; and there is an indomitable energy, which, after rearing an empire in the wilderness, is fresh for new achievements. Such a people are not ruined, because Congress leaves the treasury bankrupt for weeks and months, and exposes itself to scorn by vulgar manners and ruffian abuse. In that very body, how many men may be found of honour, integrity, and wisdom, who watch over their country with sorrow but not despair, and who meet an answer to their patriotism in the breasts of thousands of their countrymen!

There is one Duty of the Free States of which I have not spoken; it is the duty of *Faith in the intellectual and moral energies of the country, in its high destiny, and in the good* Providence which has guided it through so many trials and perils to its present greatness. We, indeed, suffer much and deserve to suffer more. Many dark pages are to be written in our history. But generous seed is still sown in this nation's mind. Noble impulses are working here. We are called to be witnesses to the world of a freer, more equal, more humane, more enlightened social existence than has yet been known. May God raise us to a more thorough comprehension of our work. May He give us faith in the good which we are summoned to achieve. May He strengthen us to build up a prosperity, not

tainted by slavery, selfishness, or any wrong, but pure, innocent, righteous, and overflowing, through a just and generous intercourse, on all the nations of the earth.

NOTES.

In the first part of these Remarks, I said that the freedom of speech and of the press was fully enjoyed in this country. I overlooked the persecutions to which the Abolitionists have been exposed for expressing their opinions. That I should have forgotten this is the more strange, because my sympathy with these much injured persons has been one motive to me for writing on slavery. The Free States, as far as they have violated the rights of the Abolitionists, have ceased to be fully free. They have acted as the tools of slavery, and have warred against freedom in its noblest form. No matter what other liberties are conceded, if liberty of speech and the press be denied us. We are robbed of our most precious right, of that without which all other rights are unprotected and insecure.

Since the publication of the first edition of this tract, I have been sorry to learn, that the paragraph at the foot of page 322 has been considered by some as showing an insensibility to the depraving influences of slavery. My purpose was to be just to the South; and I did not dream, that, in doing this, I was throwing a veil over the deformity of its institutions. I feel deeply, what I have again and again said, that slavery does and must exert an exceedingly depraving influence. So wrongful an exercise of power cannot but injure the character. All who sustain the relation are

the worse for it. But it is a plain fact taught by all history and experience, that under depraving institutions much virtue may exist; and were not this the case, the condition of our race would be hopeless indeed, for everywhere such institutions are found. The character is not determined by a single relation or circumstance in our lot. Most of us believe that Roman Catholicism exerts many influences hostile to true Christianity, and yet how many sincere Christians have grown up under that system! In the midst of feudal barbarism, in the palaces of despotism, noble characters have been formed.—Slavery, I believe, does incalculable harm to the slave-holders. It spreads licentiousness of manners to a fearful extent; and in the case of the good it obscures their perception of those most important teachings of Christianity, which unfold the intimate relation of man to man, and which enjoin universal love. Still it cannot be denied, that under all these disadvantages, God finds true worshippers within the bounds of slavery; that many deeds of Christian love are performed there, and that there are not wanting examples of eminent virtue. This is what I meant to say. I am bound however to add, that the more I become acquainted with the Slave-holding States, the more I am impressed with the depraving influence of Slavery; and I shall grieve, if my desire to be just to the South, and my joy at witnessing virtue there, should be construed as a negative testimony in favour of this corrupting institution.

ADDRESS

ON OCCASION OF

THE ANNIVERSARY

OF THE

EMANCIPATION OF THE SLAVES

IN THE BRITISH WEST INDIA ISLANDS,

DELIVERED AT LENOX, MASSACHUSETTS, 1ST AUGUST, 1842.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

I have been encouraged to publish the following Address by the strong expressions of sympathy with which it was received. I do not indeed suppose that those who listened to it with interest, and who have requested its publication, accorded with me in every opinion which it contains. Such entire agreement is not to be expected among intelligent men, who judge for themselves. But I am sure that the spirit and substance of the Address met a hearty response. Several paragraphs, which I wanted strength to deliver, are now published, and for these, of course, I am alone responsible.

I dedicate this Address to the Men and Women of Berkshire. I have found so much to delight me in the magnificent scenery of this region, in its peaceful and prosperous villages, and in the rare intelligence and virtues of the friends whose hospitality I have here enjoyed, that I desire to connect this little work with this spot. I cannot soon forget the beautiful nature and the generous spirits with which I have been privileged to commune in the Valley of the Housatonick.

LENOX, MASS. *Aug.* 9, 1842.

ADDRESS.

THIS day is the anniversary of one of the great events of modern times, the Emancipation of the Slaves in the British West India Islands. This Emancipation began August 1st, 1834, but it was not completed until August 21st, 1838. The event indeed has excited little attention in our country, partly because we are too much absorbed in private interests and local excitements to be alive to the triumphs of humanity at a distance, partly because a moral contagion has spread from the South through the North and deadened our sympathies with the oppressed. But West India emancipation, though received here so coldly, is yet an era in the annals of philanthropy. The greatest events do not always draw most attention at the moment. When the May-flower, in the dead of winter, landed a few pilgrims, on the ice-bound, snow-buried rocks of Plymouth, the occurrence made no noise. Nobody took note of it, and yet how much has that landing done to change the face of the civilised world! Our fathers came to establish a pure church; they little thought of

revolutionizing nations. The emancipation in the West Indies, whether viewed in itself, or in its immediate results, or in the spirit from which it grew, or in the light of hope which it sheds on the future, deserves to be commemorated. In some respects it stands alone in human history. I therefore invite to it your serious attention.

Perhaps I ought to begin with some apology for my appearance in this place; for I stand here unasked, uninvited. I can plead no earnest solicitation from few or many for the service I now render. I come to you simply from an impulse in my own breast; and in truth had I been solicited, I probably should not have consented to speak. Had I found here a general desire to celebrate this day, I should have felt that another speaker might be enlisted in the cause, and I should have held my peace. But finding that no other voice would be raised, I was impelled to lift up my own, though too feeble for any great exertion. I trust you will accept with candour what I have been obliged to prepare in haste, and what may have little merit but that of pure intention.

I have said that I speak only from the impulse of my own mind. I am the organ of no association, the representative of no feelings but my own. But I wish it to be understood, that I speak from no sudden impulse; from no passionate zeal of a new convert; but from deliberate and long cherished conviction. In truth, my attention was directed to Slavery fifty years ago, that is, before most of you were born; and the first impulse came from a venerable man, formerly of great reputation in this part of our country and in all our churches, the Rev. Dr. Hopkins, who removed more than a cen-

tury ago from Great Barrington to my native town, and there bore open and strong testimony against the Slave Trade, a principal branch of the traffic of the place. I am reminded by the spot where I now stand, of another incident which may show how long I have taken an interest in this subject. More than twenty years ago, I had an earnest conversation with that noble-minded man and fervent philanthropist, Henry Sedgwick, so well and honourably known to most who hear me, on which occasion we deplored the insensibility of the North to the evils of Slavery and inquired by what means it might be removed. The circumstance which particularly gave my mind a direction to this subject was a winter's residence in a West Indian island more than eleven years ago. I lived there on a plantation. The piazza in which I sat and walked almost from morning till night, overlooked the negro village belonging to the estate. A few steps placed me in the midst of their huts. Here was a volume on Slavery opened always before my eyes, and how could I help learning some of its lessons? The gang on this estate (for such is the name given to a company of slaves) was the best on the island, and among the best in the West Indies. The proprietor had laboured to collect the best materials for it. His gang had been his pride and boast. The fine proportions, the graceful and sometimes dignified bearing of these people, could hardly be overlooked. Unhappily misfortune had reduced the owner to bankruptcy. The estate had been mortgaged to a stranger who could not personally superintend it, and I found it under the care of a passionate and licentious manager, in whom the poor slaves found a sad contrast to the kindness of former

days. They sometimes came to the house where I resided, with their mournful or indignant complaints; but were told that no redress could be found from the hands of their late master. In this case of a plantation passing into strange hands, I saw that the mildest form of slavery might at any time be changed into the worst. On returning to this country I delivered a discourse on Slavery, giving the main views which I have since communicated; and this was done before the cry of Abolitionism was heard among us. I seem, then, to have a peculiar warrant for now addressing you. I am giving you not the ebullitions of new vehement feelings, but the results of long and patient reflection; not the thoughts of others, but my own independent judgments. I stand alone; I speak in the name of no party. I have no connection, but that of friendship and respect, with the opposers of Slavery in this country or abroad. Do not mix me up with other men good or bad; but listen to me as a separate witness, standing on my own ground, and desirous to express with all plainness what seems to be the truth.

On this day a few years ago, Eight Hundred Thousand human beings were set free from slavery; and to comprehend the greatness of the deliverance, a few words must first be said of the evil from which they were rescued. You must know Slavery to know Emancipation. But in a single discourse, how can I set before you the wrongs and abominations of this detestable institution? I must pass over many of its features, and will select one, which is at present vividly impressed on my mind. Different minds are impressed with different evils. Were I asked, what strikes me as the greatest evil inflicted by this system, I should say, it

is the outrage offered by slavery to human nature. Slavery does all that lies in human power to unmake men, to rob them of their humanity, to degrade men into brutes; and this it does by declaring them to be Property. Here is the master evil. Declare a man a chattel, something which you may own and may turn to your use, as a horse or a tool; strip him of all right over himself, of all right to use his own powers, except what you concede to him as a favour and deem consistent with your own profit; and you cease to look on him as a Man. You may call him such; but he is not to you a brother, a fellow-being, a partaker of your nature, and your equal in the sight of God. You view him, you treat him, you speak to him, as infinitely beneath you, as belonging to another race. You have a tone and a look towards him, which you never use towards a man. Your relation to him demands that you treat him as an inferior creature. You cannot if you would treat him as a man. That he may answer your end, that he may consent to be a slave, his spirit must be broken, his courage crushed; he must fear you. A feeling of his deep inferiority must be burned into his soul. The idea of his rights must be quenched in him, by the blood of his lashed and lacerated body. Here is the damning evil of slavery. It destroys the spirit, the consciousness of a man. I care little in comparison for his hard outward lot, his poverty, his unfurnished house, his coarse fare; the terrible thing in slavery is the spirit of a slave, the extinction of the spirit of a man. He feels himself owned, a chattel, a thing bought and sold, and held to sweat for another's pleasure, at another's will, under another's lash, just as an ox or horse. Treated thus as a brute, can he

take a place among men? A slave! Is there a name so degraded on earth, a name which so separates a man from his kind? And to this condition millions of our race are condemned in this land of liberty.

In what is the slave treated as a Man? The great right of a Man is to use, improve, expand his powers, for his own and others' good. The slave's powers belong to another, and are hemmed in, kept down, not cherished, or suffered to unfold. If there be an infernal system, one especially hostile to humanity, it is that which deliberately wars against the expansion of men's faculties; and this enters into the essence of slavery. The slave cannot be kept a slave, if helped or allowed to improve his intellect and higher nature. He must not be taught to read. The benevolent Christian, who tries, by giving him the use of letters, to open to him the Word of God and other good books, is punished as a criminal. The slave is hedged round, so that philanthropy cannot approach him to awaken in him the intelligence and feelings of a man. Thus his humanity is trodden under foot.

Again: a Man has the right to form and enjoy the relations of domestic life. The tie between the brute and his young endures but a few months. Man was made to have a home, to have a wife and children, to cleave to them for life, to sustain the domestic relations in constancy and purity, and through these holy ties to refine and exalt his nature. Such is the distinction of a man. But slavery violates the sanctity of home. It makes the young woman property, and gives her no protection from licentiousness. It either disallows marriage, or makes it a vain show. It sunders husband and wife, sells them into distant regions, and then

compels them to break the sacred tie and contract new alliances, in order to stock the plantation with human slaves. Scripture and nature say, "What God hath joined, let not man put asunder;" but slavery scorns God's voice in his Word and in the human heart. Even the Christian church dares not remonstrate against the wrong, but sanctions it, and encourages the poor ignorant slave to form a new, adulterous connexion, that he may minister to his master's gain. The slaveholder enters the hut of his bondsman, to do the work which belongs only to death, and to do it with nothing of the consolatory, healing influences which Christianity sheds round death. He goes to tear the wife from the husband, the child from the mother, to exile them from one another, and to convey them to unknown masters. Is this to see a man in a slave? Is not this to place him beneath humanity?

Again: It is the right, privilege, and distinction of a Man, not only to be connected with a family, but with his race. He is made for free communion with his fellow-creatures. One of the sorest evils of life is to be cut off from the mass of men, from the social body; to be treated by the multitude of our fellow-creatures as outcasts, as Pariahs, as a fallen race, unworthy to be approached, unworthy of the deference due to men; and this infinite wrong is done to the slave. A slave! that name severs all his ties except with beings as degraded as himself. He has no country, no pride or love of nation, no sympathy with the weal or woe of the land which gave him birth, no joy in its triumphs, no generous sorrow for its humiliation, no feeling of that strong unity with those around him which common laws, a common government, and a common history create. He is not

allowed to go forth, as other men are, and to connect himself with strangers, to form new alliances by means of trade, business, conversation. Society is everywhere barred against him. An iron wall forbids his access to his race. The miscellaneous intercourse of man with man, which strengthens the feeling of our common humanity, and perhaps does more than all things to enlarge the intellect, is denied him. The world is nothing to him: he does not hear of it. The plantation is his world. To him the universe is narrowed down almost wholly to the hut where he sleeps, and the fields where he sweats for another's gain. Beyond these he must not step without leave; and even if allowed to wander, who has a respectful look or word for the slave? In that name he carries with him an atmosphere of repulsion. It drives men from him as if he were a leper. However gifted by God, however thirsting for some higher use of his powers, he must hope for no friend beyond the ignorant, half-brutalised caste with which bondage has united him. To him there is no race, as there is no country. In truth, so fallen is he beneath sympathy, that multitudes will smile at hearing him compassionated for being bereft of these ties. Still, he suffers great wrong. Just in proportion as you sever a man from his country and race, he ceases to be a man. The rudest savage, who has a tribe with which he sympathises, and for which he is ready to die, is far exalted above the slave. How much more exalted is the poorest freeman in a civilised land, who feels his relation to a wide community; who lives under equal laws to which the greatest bow; whose social ties change and enlarge with the vicissitudes of life; whose mind and heart are open to the quickening,

stirring influences of this various world! Poor slave! humanity's outcast and orphan! to whom no door is open, but that of the naked hut of thy degraded caste! art thou indeed a man? Dost thou belong to the human brotherhood? What is thy whole life but continued insult? Thou meetest no look which does not express thy hopeless exclusion from human sympathies. Thou mayest indeed be pitied in sickness and pain, and so is the animal. The deference due to a man, and which keeps alive a man's spirit, is unknown to thee. The intercourse which makes the humblest individual in other spheres partaker more or less in the improvements of his race, thou must never hope for. May I not say, then, that nothing extinguishes humanity like slavery?

In reply to these and other representations of the wrongs and evils of this institution, we are told that slaves are well fed, well clothed, at least better than the peasantry and operatives in many other countries; and this is gravely adduced as a vindication of slavery. A man capable of offering it, ought, if any one ought, to be reduced to bondage. A man, who thinks food and raiment a compensation for liberty, who would counsel men to sell themselves, to become property, to give up all rights and power over themselves, for a daily mess of pottage, however savoury, is a slave in heart. He has lost the spirit of a man, and would be less wronged than other men if a slave's collar were welded round his neck.

The domestic slave is well fed, we are told, and so are the domestic animals. A nobleman's horse in England is better lodged and more pampered than the operatives in Manchester. The grain which the horse

consumes might support a starving family. How sleek and shining his coat! How gay and rich his caparison! But why is he thus curried, and pampered, and bedecked? To be bitted and curbed; and then to be mounted by his master, who arms himself with whip and spur to put the animal to his speed; and if any accident mar his strength or swiftness, he is sold from his luxuriant stall to be flayed, overworked, and hastened out of life by the merciless drayman. Suppose the nobleman should say to the half-starved, ragged operative of Manchester, "I will give up my horse, and feed and clothe you with like sumptuousness, on condition that I may mount you daily with lash and spurs, and sell you when I can make a profitable bargain." Would you have the operative, for the sake of good fare and clothes, take the lot of the brute? or, in other words, become a slave? What reply would the heart of an Old England or New England labourer make to such a proposal? and yet, if there be any soundness in the argument drawn from the slave's comforts, he ought to accept it thankfully and greedily.

Such arguments for slavery are insults. The man capable of using them ought to be rebuked as mean in spirit, hard of heart, and wanting all true sympathy with his race. I might reply, if I thought fit, to this account of the slave's blessings, that there is nothing very enviable in this food and wardrobe, that his comforts make no approach to those of the nobleman's horse, and that a labourer of New England would prefer the fare of many an alms-house at home. But I cannot stoop to such reasoning. Be the comforts of the slave what they may, they are no compensation for the degradation, insolence, indignities, ignorance, servility,

scars, and violations of domestic rights to which he is exposed.

I have spoken of what seems to me the grand evil of slavery, the outrage it offers to human nature. It would be easy to enlarge on other fatal tendencies and effects of this institution. But I forbear, not only for want of time, but because I feel no need of a minute exposition of its wrongs and miseries to make it odious. I cannot endure to go through a laboured proof of its iniquitous and injurious nature. No man wants such proof. He carries the evidence in his own heart. I need nothing but the most general view of slavery, to move my indignation towards it. I am more and more accustomed to throw out of sight its particular evils, its details of wrong and suffering, and to see in it simply an institution which deprives men of Freedom; and when I thus view it, I am taught immediately, by an unerring instinct, that slavery is an intolerable wrong. Nature cries aloud for Freedom as our proper good, our birthright, and our end, and resents nothing so much as its loss. It is true, that we are placed at first in subjection to others' wills, and spend childhood and youth under restraint. But we are governed at first, that we may learn to govern ourselves; we begin with leading-strings, that we may learn to go alone. The discipline of the parent is designed to train up his children to act for themselves, and from a principle of duty in their own breasts. The child is not subjected to his father to be a slave, but to grow up to the energy, responsibility, relations, and authority of a man. Freedom, courage, moral force, efficiency, independence, the large, generous action of the soul, these are the blessings in store for us, the grand

ends to which the restraints of education, of family, of school and college, are directed. Nature knows no such thing as a perpetual yoke. Nature bends no head to the dust, to look for ever downward. Nature makes no man a chattel. Nature has implanted in all souls the thirst, the passion for liberty. Nature stirs the heart of the child, and prompts it to throw out its little limbs in restlessness and joy, and to struggle against restraint. Nature impels the youth to leap, to run, to put forth all his powers, to look with impatience on prescribed bounds, to climb the steep, to dive into the ocean, to court danger, to spread himself through the new world which he was born to inherit. Nature's life, nature's impulse, nature's joy, is Freedom. A greater violence to nature cannot be conceived, than to rob man of liberty.

What is the end and essence of life? It is to expand all our faculties and affections. It is to grow, to gain by exercise new energy, new intellect, new love. It is to hope, to strive, to bring out what is within us, to press towards what is above us. In other words, it is to be Free. Slavery is thus at war with the true life of human nature. Undoubtedly there is a power in the soul, which the loss of freedom cannot always subdue. There have been men, doomed to perpetual bondage, who have still thought and felt nobly, looked up to God with trust, and learned by experience, that even bondage, like all other evils, may be made the occasion of high virtue. But these are exceptions. In the main, our nature is too weak to grow under the weight of chains.

To illustrate the supreme importance of Freedom, I would offer a remark, which may sound like a paradox,

but will be found to be true. It is this, that even Despotism is endurable, only because it bestows a degree of freedom. Despotism, bad as it is, supplants a greater evil, and that is anarchy; and anarchy is worse, chiefly because it is more enslaving. In anarchy all restraint is plucked from the strong, who make a prey of the weak; subduing them by terror, seizing on their property, and treading every right under foot. When the laws are prostrated, arbitrary, passionate, lawless will, the will of the strongest, exasperated by opposition, must prevail; and under this the rights of person as well as property are cast down, and a palsying fear imposes on men's spirits a heavier chain than was ever forged by an organised despotism. In the whole history of tyranny in France, liberty was never so crushed as in the reign of terror in the revolution, when mobs and lawless combinations usurped the power of the State. A despot to be safe must establish a degree of order, and this implies laws, tribunals, and some administration of justice, however rude; and still more, he has an interest in protecting industry and property to some degree, in order that he may extort the more from his people's earnings under the name of revenue. Thus despotism is an advance towards liberty; and in this its strength very much lies; for the people have a secret consciousness, that their rights suffer less, under one, than under many tyrants, under an organised absolutism, than under wild, lawless, passionate force: and on this conviction, as truly as on armies, rests the despot's throne. Thus freedom and rights are ever cherished goods of human nature. Man keeps them in sight even when most crushed; and just in proportion as civilization and intelligence advance, he secures them

more and more. This is infallibly true, notwithstanding opposite appearances. The old forms of despotism may indeed continue in a progressive civilization, but their force declines; and public opinion, the will of the community, silently establishes a sway over what seems and is denominated, absolute power. We have a striking example of this truth in Prussia, where the King seems unchecked, but where a code of wise and equal laws ensures to every man his rights to a degree experienced in few other countries, and where the administration of justice cannot safely be obstructed by the will of the sovereign. Thus freedom, man's dearest birthright, is the good towards which civil institutions tend. It is at once the sign and the means, the cause and the effect of human progress. It exists in a measure under tyrannical governments, and gives them their strength. Nowhere is it wholly broken down, but under domestic slavery. Under this, man is made Property. Here lies the damning taint, the accursed blighting power, the infinite evil of bondage.

On this day, four years ago, Eight Hundred Thousand human beings were set free from the terrible evil of which I have given a faint sketch. Eight hundred thousand of our brethren, who had lived in darkness and the shadow of death, were visited with the light of liberty. Instead of the tones of absolute, debasing command, a new voice broke on their ears, calling them to come forth, to be free. They were, undoubtedly, too rude, too ignorant, to comprehend the greatness of the blessing conferred on them this day. Freedom to them undoubtedly seemed much what it is not. Children in intellect, they seized on it as a child on a holiday. But Slavery had not wholly stifled in

them the instincts, feelings, judgments of men. They felt, on this day, that the whip of the brutal overseer was broken; and was that no cause for exulting joy? They felt that wife and child could no longer be insulted or scourged in their sight, and they be denied the privilege of lifting up a voice in their behalf. Was that no boon? They felt that henceforth they were to work from their own wills, for their own good, that they might earn perhaps a hut, which they might call their own, and which the foot of a master could not profane, nor a master's interest lay waste. Can you not conceive how they stretched out their limbs, and looked on them with a new joy, saying, These are our own? Can you not conceive how they leaped with a new animation, exulting to put forth powers, which were from that day to be "their own"? Can you not conceive how they looked round them on the fields and hills, and said to themselves, We can go now where we will; and how they continued to live in their huts with new content, because they could leave them if they would? Can you not conceive, how dim ideas of a better lot dawned on their long dormant minds; how the future, once a blank, began to brighten before them; how hope began to spread her unused pinions; how the faculties and feelings of men came to a new birth within them? The father and mother took their child to their arms and said, Nobody can sell you from us now. Was not that enough to give them a new life? The husband and wife began to feel, that there was an inviolable sanctity in marriage; and a glimpse, however faint, of a moral spiritual bond, began to take place of the loose sensual tie, which had held them together. Still more, and what deserves special note, the coloured man raised his

eyes, on this day, to the white man, and saw the infinite chasm between himself and the white race growing narrower; saw and felt that he too was a Man, that he too had rights; that he belonged to the common Father, not to a frail, selfish creature; that under God he was his own master. A rude feeling of dignity, in strange contrast with the abjectness of the slave, gave new courage to that look, gave a firmer tone, a manlier tread. This, had I been there, would have interested me especially. The tumult of joyful feeling bursting forth in the broken language which slavery had taught, I should have sympathised with. But the sight of the slave rising into a man, looking on the white race with a steady eye, with the secret consciousness of a common nature, and beginning to comprehend his heaven-descended, inalienable rights, would have been the crowning joy.

It was natural to expect that the slaves, on the first of August, receiving the vast, incomprehensible gift of freedom, would have rushed into excess. It would not have surprised me, had I heard of intemperance, tumult, violence. Liberty, that mighty boon, for which nations have shed rivers of their best blood, for which they have toiled and suffered for years, perhaps for ages, was given to these poor, ignorant creatures in a day, and given to them after lives of cruel bondage, immeasurably more cruel than any political oppression. Would it have been wonderful, if they had been intoxicated by the sudden, vast transition, if they had put to shame the authors of their freedom, by an immediate abuse of it? Happily, the poor negroes had enjoyed one privilege in their bondage. They had learned something of Christianity, very little indeed, yet

enough to teach them that liberty was the gift of God. That mighty power, religion, had begun a work within them. The African nature seems singularly susceptible of this principle. Benevolent missionaries, whom the anti-slavery spirit of England had sent into the colonies, had for some time been working on the degraded mind of the bondmen, and not wholly in vain. The slaves, whilst denied the rank of men by their race, had caught the idea of their relation to the Infinite Father. That great doctrine of the Universal, Impartial Love of God, embracing the most obscure, dishonoured, oppressed, had dawned on them. Their new freedom thus became associated with religion, the mightiest principle on earth, and by this it was not merely saved from excess, but made the spring of immediate elevation.

Little did I imagine, that the emancipation of the Slaves, was to be invested with holiness and moral sublimity. Little did I expect, that my heart was to be touched by it, as by few events in history. But the emotions with which I first read the narrative of the great gift of liberty in Antigua, are still fresh in my mind. Let me read to you the story: none, I think, can hear it unmoved. It is the testimony of trustworthy men, who visited the West Indies to observe the effects of Emancipation.

"To convey to the reader some account of the way in which the great crisis passed, we here give the substance of several accounts which were related to us in different parts of the island, by those who witnessed them:—

"The Wesleyans kept watch-night in all their chapels, on the night of the 31st of July. One of the Wesleyan missionaries gave us an account of the watch meeting at the chapel in St. John's.

The capacious house was filled with the candidates for liberty. All was animation and eagerness. A mighty chorus of voices swelled the song of expectation and joy, and as they united in prayer, the voice of the leader was drowned in the universal acclamation of thanksgiving, and praise, and blessing, and honour, and glory to God who had come down for their deliverance. In such exercises the evening was spent until the hour of twelve approached. The missionary then proposed, that when the clock on the cathedral should begin to strike, the whole congregation should fall upon their knees and receive the boon of freedom in silence. Accordingly, as the loud bell tolled its first notes, the crowded assembly prostrated themselves on their knees. All was silent, save the quivering half-stifled breath of the struggling spirit. The slow notes of the clock fell upon the multitude; peal on peal, peal on peal, rolled over the prostrate throng, in tones of angels' voices, thrilling among the desolate chords and weary heart-strings. Scarce had the clock sounded its last note, when the lightning flashed vividly around, and a loud peal of thunder rolled along the sky; God's pillar of fire, and trump of jubilee! A moment of profoundest silence passed; then came the burst; they broke forth in prayer; they shouted, they sung, "Glory Alleluia;" they clapped their hands, leaped up, fell down, clasped each other in their free arms, cried, laughed, and went to and fro, tossing upwards their unfettered hands; but high above the whole there was a mighty sound which ever and anon swelled up; it was the uttering, in negro broken dialect, of gratitude to God.

"After this gush of excitement had spent itself, and the congregation became calm, the religious exercises were resumed, and the remainder of the night was occupied in singing and prayer, in reading the Bible, and in addresses from the missionaries, explaining the nature of the freedom just received, and exhorting the freed people to be industrious, steady, obedient to the laws, and to show themselves in all things worthy of the high boon which God had conferred upon them.

"The first of August came on Friday, and a release was proclaimed from all work until the next Monday. The day was chiefly spent, by the great mass of negroes, in the churches and chapels. Thither they flocked as clouds, and as doves to their

windows. The clergy and missionaries throughout the island were actively engaged, seizing the opportunity, in order to enlighten the people on all the duties and responsibilities of their new situation, and, above all, urging them to the attainment of that higher liberty with which Christ maketh his children free. In every quarter we were assured that the day was like a Sabbath. Work had ceased; the hum of business was still, and noise and tumult were unheard in the streets. Tranquillity pervaded the towns and country. A Sabbath indeed! when the wicked ceased from troubling, and the weary were at rest, and the slave was freed from the master! The planters informed us, that they went to the chapels where their own people were assembled, greeted them, shook hands with them, and exchanged most hearty good wishes." *

Such is the power of true religion on the rudest minds; such the deep fountain of feeling in the African soul; such the race of men whom we are trampling in the dust. How few of our assemblies, with all our intelligence and refinement, offer to God this overflowing gratitude, this profound, tender, rapturous homage! True, the Slaves poured out their joy with a childlike violence; but we see a childhood full of promise. And why do we place this race beneath us? Because nature has burned on them a darker hue. But does the essence of humanity live in colour? Is the black man less a man than the white? Has he not human powers, human rights? Does his colour reach to his soul? Is reason in him a whit blacker than in us? Have his conscience and affections been dipped in an inky flood? To the eye of God are his pure thoughts and kind feelings less fair than our own? We are apt to think this prejudice of colour founded in nature. But in the most enlightened countries in Europe, the man of African descent

* See "Emancipation in the West Indies," by Thorne & Kimball.

is received into the society of the great and good, as an equal and friend. It is here only that this prejudice reigns; and to this prejudice, strengthened by our subjection to southern influence, must be ascribed our indifference to the progress of liberty in the West Indies. Ought not the emancipation of nearly a million of human beings, so capable of progress as the African race, to have sent a thrill of joy through a nation of freemen? But this great event was received in our country with indifference. Humanity, justice, Christian sympathy, the love of liberty, found but few voices here. Nearly a million of men, at no great distance from our land, passed from the most degrading bondage into the ranks of freedom, with hardly a welcome from these shores.

Perhaps you will say, that we are bound to wait for the fruits of emancipation, before we celebrate it as a great event in history. I think not so. We ought to rejoice immediately, without delay, whenever an act of justice is done, especially a grand public act, subverting the oppression of ages. We ought to triumph when the right prospers, without waiting for consequences. We ought not to doubt about consequences, when men, in obedience to conscience, and in the exercise of their best wisdom, redress a mighty wrong. If God reigns, then the subversion of a vast crime, then the breaking of an unrighteous yoke must in its final results be good. Undoubtedly an old abuse, which has sent its roots through society, cannot be removed without inconvenience or suffering. Indeed, no great social change, however beneficial, can occur without partial, temporary pain. But must abuses be sheltered without end, and human progress given up in despair, because some, who have fattened on wrongs, will cease to pros-

per at the expense of their brethren. Undoubtedly Slavery cannot be broken up, without deranging, in a measure, the old social order. Must, therefore, slavery be perpetual? Has the Creator laid on any portion of his children the necessity of everlasting bondage? Must wrong know no end? Has oppression a charter from God, which is never to grow old? What a libel on God, as well as on man, is the supposition, that society cannot subsist without perpetuating the degradation of a large portion of the race! Is this indeed the law of the creation, that multitudes must be oppressed? that states can subsist and prosper only through crime? Then there is no God. Then an evil spirit reigns over the universe. It is an impious error to believe that injustice is a necessity under the government of the Most High. It is disloyalty to principle, treachery to virtue, to suppose that a righteous, generous work, conceived in a sense of duty and carried on with deliberate forethought, can issue in misery, in ruin. To this want of faith in rectitude, society owes its woes, owes the licensed frauds and crimes of statesmen, the licensed frauds of trade, the continuance of slavery. Once let men put faith in rectitude, let them feel that justice is strength, that disinterestedness is a sun and a shield, that selfishness and crime are weak and miserable, and the face of the earth would be changed. The groans of ages would cease. We ought to shout for joy, not shrink like cowards, when justice and humanity triumph over established wrongs.

The emancipation of the British Islands ought, then, to have called forth acclamation at its birth. Much more should we rejoice in it now, when time has taught us the folly of the fears and the suspicions which it

awakened, and taught us the safety of doing right. Emancipation has worked well. By this, I do not mean that it has worked miracles. I have no glowing pictures to exhibit to you of the West Indian Islands. An act of the British Parliament, declaring them free, has not changed them into a paradise. A few strokes of the pen, cannot reverse the laws of nature, or conquer the almost omnipotent power of early and long-continued habit. Even in this country, where we breathe the air of freedom from our birth, and where we have grown up amidst churches and school-houses, and under wise and equal laws—even here we find no paradise. Here are crime, and poverty, and woe; and can you expect a poor ignorant race, born to bondage, scarred with the lash, uneducated, and unused to all the motives which stimulate industry, can you expect these to unlearn in a day the lessons of years, and to furnish all at once themes for eloquent description. Were you to visit those islands, you would find a slovenly agriculture, much ignorance, and more sloth than you see at home; and yet Emancipation works well—far better than could have been anticipated. To me it could hardly have worked otherwise than well. It banished slavery, that wrong and curse not to be borne. It gave freedom, the dear birthright of humanity; and had it done nothing more, I should have found in it cause for joy. Freedom, simple Freedom, is "in my estimation just, far prized above all price." I do not stop to ask if the emancipated are better fed and clothed than formerly. They are Free; and that one word contains a world of good unknown to the most pampered slave.

But emancipation has brought more than naked li-

berty. The emancipated are making progress in intelligence, comforts, purity; and progress is the great good of life. No matter where men are at any given moment, the great question about them is, are they going forward? Do they improve? Slavery was immoveable, hopeless degradation. It is the glory of liberty to favour progress; and this great blessing emancipation has bestowed. We were told, indeed, that Emancipation was to turn the green islands of the West Indies into deserts; but they still rise from the tropical sea as blooming and verdant as before. We were told, that the slaves, if set free, would break out in universal massacre; but since that event, not a report has reached us of murder perpetrated by a coloured man on the white population. We were told, that crimes would multiply; but they are diminished in every emancipated island, and very greatly in most. We were told, that the freed slave would abandon himself to idleness; and this I did anticipate, to a considerable degree, as the first result. Men, on whom industry had been forced by the lash, and who had been taught to regard sloth as their master's chief good, were strongly tempted to surrender the first days of freedom to indolent indulgence. But in this respect the evil has been so small, as to fill a reflecting man with admiration. In truth, no race but the African could have made the great transition with so little harm to themselves and others. In general, they resumed their work after a short burst of joy. The desire of property, of bettering their lot, at once sprang up within them in sufficient strength to counterbalance the love of ease. Some of them have become proprietors of the soil. New villages have grown up under their hands; their

huts are more comfortable; their dress more decent, sometimes too expensive. When I tell you, that the price of real estate in these islands has risen, and that the imports from the mother country, especially those for the labourer's use, have increased, you will judge whether the liberated slaves are living as drones. Undoubtedly, the planter has sometimes wanted workmen, and the staple product of the island, sugar, has decreased. But this can be explained without much reproach to the emancipated. The labourer, who in slavery was overtasked in the cane-field and sugar-mill, is anxious to buy or hire land sufficient for his support, and to work for himself, instead of hiring himself to another. A planter from British Guiana, informed me a few weeks ago, that a company of coloured men had paid down seventy thousand dollars for a tract of land in the most valuable part of that colony. It is not sloth, so much as a spirit of manly independence, which has withdrawn the labourer from the plantation: and this evil, if so it must be called, has been increased by his unwillingness to subject his wife and daughter to the toils of the field, which they used to bear in the days of slavery. Undoubtedly, the coloured population might do more; but they do enough to earn a better lot than they ever enjoyed, and the work of improvement goes on among them.

I pass to a still brighter view. The spirit of education has sprung up among the people to an extent worthy of admiration. We despise them; and yet there is reason to believe, that a more general desire to educate their children is to be found among them, than exists among large portions of the white population in the slaves States of the South. They have learned, that

their ignorance is the great barrier between them and the white men; and this they are in earnest to prostrate. It has been stated, that in one island, not a child above ten years of age was unable to read. Human history probably furnishes no parallel of an equal progress, in a half-civilised community.

To this must be added their interest in religious institutions. Their expenditures for the support of these are such as should put to shame the backwardness of multitudes in countries calling themselves civilised. They do more than we, in proportion to their means. Some of them have even subscribed funds for the diffusion of the Gospel in Africa, an instance of their zeal, rather than their wisdom; for they undoubtedly need all they can spare for their own instruction. Their conceptions of religion are, of course, narrow and rude, but their hearts have been touched by its simpler truths; and love is the key to higher knowledge. To this let me add, that marriage is acquiring sanctity in their eyes—that domestic life is putting on a new refinement; and you will see that this people have all the elements of social progress. Property, marriage, and religion, have been called the pillars of society; and of these the liberated slave has learned the value.

The result of all these various improvements, is what every wise friend of humanity must rejoice in. Their social position is changed. They have taken rank among men. They are no longer degraded by being looked on as degraded. They no longer live under that withering curse, the contempt of their fellow-beings. The tone in which they are spoken to, no longer expresses their infinite and hopeless depression.

They are treated as men; some of them engage in lucrative pursuits; all the paths of honour as well as of gain are open to them; they are found in the legislatures; they fill civil offices; they have military appointments; and in all these conditions acquit themselves honourably. Their humanity is recognised; and without this recognition men pine, and had better be left to perish.

I have no thought of painting these islands as Edens. That great ignorance prevails among the emancipated people, that they want our energy, that the degradation of slavery has not vanished all at once with the name, this I need not tell you. No miracle has been wrought on them. But their present lot compared with slavery, is an immense good; and when we consider, that as yet we have seen comparatively nothing of the blessed influences of freedom, we ought to thank God with something of their own fervour for the vast deliverance which he hath vouchsafed them.

We commemorate with transport the redemption of a nation from political bondage; but this is a light burden compared with personal slavery. The oppression which these United States threw off by our revolutionary struggle, was the perfection of freedom, when placed by the side of the galling, crushing, intolerable yoke which bowed the African to the dust. Thank God, it is broken. Thank God, our most injured brethren have risen to the rank of men. Thank God, Eight Hundred Thousand human beings have been made free.

These are the natural topics suggested by this day, but there are still higher views to which I invite your

attention. There are other grounds on which this first of August should be hailed with gratitude by the Christian. If I saw in the Emancipation which we celebrate, only the redemption of Eight Hundred Thousand fellow-creatures from the greatest wrong on earth, I should indeed rejoice; but I know not that I should commemorate it by public solemnities. This particular result moves me less than other views, which, though less obvious, are far more significant and full of promise.

When I look at West Indian emancipation, what strikes me most forcibly and most joyfully, is the Spirit in which it had its origin. What broke the slaves' chain? Did a foreign invader summon them to his standard, and reward them with freedom for their help in conquering their masters? Or did they owe liberty to their own exasperated valour; to courage maddened by despair; to massacre and unsparing revenge? Or did calculations of the superior profit of free labour, persuade the owner to emancipation as a means of superior gain? No. West Indian emancipation was the fruit of Christian principle acting on the mind and heart of a great people. The liberator of those slaves was Jesus Christ. That voice, which rebuked disease and death, and set their victims free, broke the heavier chain of slavery. The conflict against slavery began in England about fifty years ago. It began with Christians. It was at its birth a Christian enterprise. Its power was in the consciences and generous sympathy of men who had been trained in the school of Christ. It was resisted by prejudice, custom, interest, opulence, pride, and the civil power. Almost the whole weight of the commercial class was at first thrown into the opposite scale. The politician dreaded the effects of

abolition on the wealth and revenue of the nation. The King did not disguise his hostility; and I need not tell you that it found little favour with the aristocracy. The titled and proud are not the first to sympathise with the abject. The cause had nothing to rely on but the spirit of the English people; and that people did respond to the reasonings, pleadings, rebukes of Christian philanthropy, as nation never did before. The history of this warfare cannot be read without seeing, that, once at least, a great nation was swayed by high and disinterested principles. Men of the world deride the notion of influencing human affairs by any but selfish motives; and it is a melancholy truth, that the movements of nations have done much to confirm the darkest views of human nature. What a track of crime, desolation, war, we are called by history to travel over! Still history is lighted up by great names, by noble deeds, by patriots and martyrs; and especially in Emancipation we see a great nation putting forth its power and making great sacrifices, for a distant, degraded race of men, who had no claims but those of wronged and suffering humanity. Some, and not a few, have blamed, as superfluous, the compensation given by England to the planter for the slaves. On one account I rejoice at it. It is a testimony to the disinterested motives of the nation. A people, groaning under a debt which would crush any other people, borrowed Twenty Million pounds sterling (a hundred million of dollars), and paid it as the price of the slaves' freedom. This act stands alone in the page of history, and Emancipation having such an origin, deserves to be singled out for public commemoration.

What gave peculiar interest to this act, was the

fallen, abject state of the people on whom freedom was conferred at such a cost. They were not Englishmen.. They had no claim founded on common descent, on common history, or any national bond. There was nothing in their lot to excite the imagination. They had done nothing to draw regard. They weighed nothing in human affairs. They belonged to no nation. They were hardly recognised as men. Humanity could hardly wear a more abject form. But under all this abjectness, under that black skin, under those scars of the lash, under those half-naked bodies put up to auction, and sold as cattle, the people of England saw the lineaments of humanity, saw fellow-creatures, saw the capacities and rights and immortal destinies of men, and in the spirit of brotherhood, and from reverence for humanity, broke their chains.

When I look at this act, I do not stop at its immediate results, at the Emancipation of Eight Hundred Thousand human beings, nor do I look at the act as standing alone. I look at the spirit from which it sprung, and see here a grand and most cheering foundation of human hope. I see that Christianity has not come into the world in vain. I see that the blood of the cross was not shed in vain. I see that the prophecies in the Scriptures of a mighty change in human affairs, were not idle words. It is true, that Christianity has done little compared with these predictions. The corruptions of our age, who is so blind as not to see? But that a new principle, derived from Christianity and destined to renovate the earth, is at work among these various elements; that silently a new spirit of humanity, a new respect for human nature, a new comprehension of human rights, a new feeling of

brotherhood, and new ideas of a higher social state, have been and are unfolding themselves, under the influences of Christian truth and Christian civilization, who can deny? Society is not what it once was. Amidst all the stir of selfish passion, the still voice of Christianity is heard; a diviner spirit mixes, however imperfectly, with the workings of worldliness; and we are beginning to learn the mighty revolution which a heavenly faith is to accomplish here on earth.

Christianity is the hope of the world, and we ought to regard every conspicuous manifestation of its spirit and power, as an era in human history. We are dazzled by revolutions of empires; we hope much from the rise or fall of governments. But nothing but Christianity can regenerate the earth; and, accordingly, we should hail with joy every sign of a clearer comprehension, and a deeper feeling of its truths. Christianity, truly understood, has a direct tendency to that renovation of the world which it foretells. It is not an abstract system, secluding the disciple from his kind; but it makes him one with his race, breaks down all barriers between him and his brethren, arms him with a martyr's spirit in the cause of humanity, sends him forth to be a saviour of the lost; and just as far as Christianity is thus viewed and felt by its followers, the redemption of the world draws nigh. These views of religion are making their way. They dawn upon us not only in emancipation, but in many other movements of our age; not that they have ever been wholly obscured; but the rank which they hold in the Christian system, and the vast social changes which they involve, have not, until the present day, been dreamed of.

All the doctrines of Christianity are more and more seen to be bonds of close, spiritual, reverential union between man and man, and this is the most cheering view of our time. Christianity is a revelation of the infinite, universal, parental love of God towards his human family, comprehending the most sinful, descending to the most fallen, and its aim is to breathe the same love into its disciples. It shows us Christ tasting death for every man, and it summons us to take his cross, or to participate of his sufferings in the same cause. Its doctrine of Immortality gives infinite worth to every human being; for every one is destined to this endless life. The doctrine of the "Word made flesh," shows us God uniting himself most intimately with our nature, manifesting himself in a human form, for the very end of making us partakers of his own perfection. The doctrine of Grace, as it is termed, reveals the Infinite Father imparting his Holy Spirit, the best gift he can impart, to the humblest human being who implores it. Thus love and reverence for human nature, a love for man stronger than death, is the very spirit of Christianity. Undoubtedly this spirit is faintly comprehended by the best of us. Some of its most striking expressions, are still derided in society. Society still rests on selfish principles. Men sympathise still with the prosperous and great, not the abject and down-trodden. But amidst this degradation, brighter glimpses of Christianity are caught than before. There are deeper, wider sympathies with mankind. The idea of raising up the mass of human beings to intellectual, moral, and spiritual dignity, is penetrating many minds. Among the signs of a brighter day, perhaps the West Indian Emancipation is the

most conspicuous; for in this the rights of the most despised men have been revered.

There are some among us at the present moment, who are waiting for the speedy coming of Christ. They expect, before another year closes, to see him in the clouds, to hear his voice, to stand before his judgment-seat. These illusions spring from misinterpretation of Scripture language. Christ, in the New Testament, is said to *come*, whenever his religion breaks out in new glory, or gains new triumphs. He came in the Holy Spirit in the day of Pentecost. He came in the destruction of Jerusalem, which, by subverting the old ritual law, and breaking the power of the worst enemies of his religion, ensured to it new victories. He came in the Reformation of the church. He came on this day four years ago, when, through his religion, Eight Hundred Thousand men were raised from the lowest degradation to the rights, and dignity, and fellowship of men. Christ's outward appearance is of little moment, compared with the brighter manifestation of his spirit. The Christian, whose inward eyes and ears are touched by God, discerns the coming of Christ, hears the sound of his chariot-wheels and the voice of his trumpet, when no other perceives them. He discerns the Saviour's advent in the dawning of higher truth on the world, in new aspirations of the church after perfection, in the prostration of prejudice and error, in brighter expressions of Christian love, in more enlightened and intense consecration of the Christian to the cause of humanity, freedom, and religion. Christ comes in the conversion, the regeneration, the emancipation of the world.

You here see why it is that I rejoice in the great event which this day commemorates. To me this event does not stand alone. It is a sign of the triumph of Christianity, and a presage and herald of grander victories of truth and humanity. Christianity did not do its last work when it broke the slave's chain. No; this was but a type of what it is to achieve. Since the African was emancipated, the drunkard has been set free. We may count the disenthralled from intemperance by hundreds of thousands, almost by millions, and this work has been achieved by Christian truth and Christian love. In this, we have a new proof of the coming of Christ in his kingdom; and the grand result of these and other kindred movements of our times, should be, to give us a new faith in what Christianity is to accomplish. We need this faith. We are miserably wanting in it. We scarcely believe what we see of the triumphs of the cross. This is the most disastrous unbelief of our times. I am pointed now and then to an infidel, as he is called, a man who denies Christianity. But there is a sadder sight. It is that of thousands and millions who profess Christianity, but have no faith in its power to accomplish the work to which it is ordained, no faith in the power of Christ over the passions, prejudices, and corrupt institutions of men, no faith in the end of his mission, in the regenerating energy of his spirit and truth. Let this day, my friends, breathe into all our souls a new trust in the destinies of our race. Let us look on the future with new hope. I see, indeed, numberless obstructions to the regeneration of the world. But is not a deep feeling of the corruptions of the world fermenting in many breasts? Is there not a new thirst for an indi-

vidual and social life more in harmony with Jesus Christ, than has yet existed? Can great truths, after having been once developed, die? Is not the human soul opening itself more and more to the divine perfection and beauty of Christ's character? And who can foretell what this mighty agency is to accomplish in the world? The present day is indeed a day of distrust, complaint, and anxious forebodings. On every side, voices of fear and despondency reach us. Let us respond to them with a voice of faith and hope. Let us not shut our eyes ungratefully on the good already wrought in our times; and seeing in this the pledge of higher blessings, let us arm ourselves with manly resolution to do or suffer, each in his own sphere, whatever may serve to prepare the way for a holier and happier age. It may be, as some believe, that this age is to be preceded by fearful judgments, by "days of vengeance," by purifying fire; but the triumphs of Christianity, however deferred, are not the less surely announced by what it has already achieved.

I have now given the more general views which belong to this occasion; but I cannot close this address without coming nearer home, and touching, however slightly, some topics of a more personal character, and in which we have a more particular interest.

I am a stranger among you; but when I look round, I feel as if the subject of this address peculiarly befitted this spot. Where am I now pleading the cause and speaking the praises of liberty? Not in crowded cities, where, amidst men's works and luxuries, and wild speculations, and eager competitions for gain, the spirit of liberty often languishes; but amidst towering mountains, embosoming peaceful vales. Amidst these vast

works of God, the soul naturally goes forth and cannot endure the thought of a chain. Your free air, which we come to inhale for health, breathes into us something better than health, even a freer spirit. Mountains have always been famed for nourishing brave souls and the love of liberty. At Thermopylæ, in many a fastness of Switzerland, in the gorges of mountains, the grand battles of liberty have been fought. Even in this country, slavery hardly sets foot on the mountains. She curses the plain; but as soon as you begin to ascend the highlands of the South, slavery begins to disappear. West Virginia and East Tennessee are cultivated chiefly by the muscles of freemen; and could these districts be erected into States, they would soon clear themselves of the guilt and shame of enslaving their brethren. Men of Berkshire! whose nerves and souls the mountain air has braced, *you* surely will respond to him who speaks of the blessings of freedom and the misery of bondage. I feel as if the feeble voice which now addresses you, must find an echo amidst these forest-crowned heights. Do they not impart something of their own power and loftiness to men's souls? Should our Commonwealth ever be invaded by victorious armies, freedom's last asylum would be here. Here may a free spirit, may reverence for all human rights, may sympathy for all the oppressed, may a stern, solemn purpose to give no sanction to oppression, take stronger and stronger possession of men's minds, and from these mountains may generous impulses spread far and wide.

The joy of this occasion is damped by one thought. Our own country is in part the land of slavery; and slavery becomes more hideous here than anywhere else,

by its contrast with our free institutions. It is deformity married to beauty. It is, as if a flame from Hell were to burst forth in the regions of the blessed. No other evil in our country, but this, should alarm us. Our other difficulties are the mists dimming our prospects for a moment. This is a dark cloud, scowling over our whole land; and within it the prophetic ear hears the low muttering of the angry thunder. We in the Free States try to escape the reproach which falls on America, by saying, that this institution is not ours, that the foot of the slave never pressed our soil; but we cannot fly from the shame or guilt of the institution, as long as we give it any support. Most unhappily, there are provisions of the Constitution binding us to give it support. Let us resolve to free ourselves from these. Let us say to the South, "we shall use no force to subvert your slavery; neither will we use it to uphold the evil." Let no temptations, no love of gain, seduce us to abet or sanction this wrong. There is something worse than to be a slave. It is to make other men slaves. Better be trampled in the dust, than trample on a fellow-creature. Much as I shrink from the evils inflicted by bondage on the millions who bear it, I would sooner endure them than inflict them on a brother. Freemen of the mountains! as far as you have power, remove from yourselves, from our dear and venerable mother the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and from all the Free States, the baseness and guilt of ministering to slavery, of acting as the Slaveholder's police, of lending him arms and strength to secure his victim. I deprecate all political action on slavery, except for one end, and this end is, to release the Free States from all connection with this oppressive institu-

tion, to sever slavery wholly from the National Government, to make it exclusively the concern of the States in which it exists. For this end, memorials should be poured in upon Congress, to obtain from that body such modifications of the laws, and such propositions to amend the constitution, as will set us free from obligation to sanction slavery. This done, political action on the subject ought to cease. We shall then have no warrant to name slavery in Congress, or to it, except by that moral influence which every man is bound to exert against every form of evil.

There are some people here more kind than wise, who are unwilling that any action or sensibility on the subject of slavery should spring up at the North, from their apprehensions of the danger of Emancipation. The danger of Emancipation! this parrot-phrase, caught from the South, is thought by many a sufficient answer to all the pleas that can be urged in favour of the slave. But the lesson of this day, is the safety of Emancipation. The West Indian Islands teach us this lesson with a thousand tongues. Emancipation can hardly take place under more unfavourable circumstances than it encountered in those islands. The master abhorred it, repelled it as long as possible, submitted to it only from force, and consequently did little to mitigate its evils, or to conciliate the freed bondman. In those Islands, the slaves were eight or ten times more numerous than the whites. Yet perfect order has followed emancipation. Since this event, the military force has been reduced, and the coloured men instead of breaking into riot, are among the soldiers by whom it is to be suppressed. In this country, the white population of the South exceeds in number the coloured;

and who that knows the two classes, can apprehend danger from the former, in case of Emancipation? Holding all the property, all the intellectual, the civil, the military power, and distinguished by courage, it seems incredible, that the white race should tremble before the coloured, should be withheld by fear from setting them free. If the alarm be real, it can be explained only by the old observation, that the injurious are prone to fear, that men naturally suspect and dread those whom they wrong. All tyrants are jealous, and persuade themselves, that were they to loosen the reins, lawlessness, pillage, murder, would disorganise society. But emancipation, conferred deliberately, and conscientiously, is safe. So say facts, and reason says the same. Chains are not the necessary bonds of society. Oppression is not the rock on which States rest. To keep the peace, you need not make the earth a province of Satan; in other words, you need not establish wrong and outrage by law. The way to keep men from cutting your throats, is not to put them under the lash, to extort their labour by force, to spoil them of their earnings, to pamper yourselves out of their compelled toil, and to keep them in brutal ignorance. Do not, do not believe this. Believe, if you will, that seeds of thistles will yield luxuriant crops of wheat; believe that drought will fertilise your fields. But do not believe that you must rob and crush your fellow-creatures, to make them harmless, to keep the State in order and peace. Oh! do not imagine that God has laid on any one the necessity of doing wrong; that He who secures the blessed harmony of the universe by wise and beneficent laws, has created a world in which all pure and righteous laws must be broken to preserve the show of

peace. I honour free inquiry, and willingly hear my cherished opinions questioned; but there are certain truths which I can no more doubt than my own existence. That God is just and good, and that justice and goodness are his laws, and are at once the safety and glory of his creatures, I can as little question as that the whole is greater than the part. When I am told, that society can only subsist by robbing men of their dearest rights, my reason is as much insulted, as if I were gravely taught that effects require no cause, or that it is the nature of yonder beautiful stream to ascend these mountains, or to return to its source. The doctrine, that violence, oppression, inhumanity is an essential element of society, is so revolting, that did I believe it, I would say, let society perish, let man and his works be swept away and the earth be abandoned to the brutes. Better that the globe should be tenanted by brutes, than brutalised men. No: it is safe to be just, to respect men's rights, to treat our neighbours as ourselves; and any doctrine hostile to this, is born of the Evil One. Men do not need to be crushed. A wise kindness avails with them more than force. Even the insane are disarmed by kindness. Once the mad-house, with its dens, fetters, strait-waistcoats, whips, horrible punishments, at which humanity now shudders and the blood boils with indignation, was thought just as necessary as slavery is now deemed at the South. But we have learned at last, that human nature, even when robbed of reason, can be ruled, calmed, restored by wise kindness; that it was only maddened and made more desperate by the chains imposed to keep it from outrage and murder. Treat men as men, and they will not prove wild beasts. We first rob them of their

humanity and then chain them because they are not human. What a picture of slavery is given by the common argument for its continuance! The slaves, we are told, must be kept under the lash, or they will turn murderers. Two millions and a-half of our fellow-creatures at the South, we are assured, have the seeds of murder in their hearts, and must be stripped of all human rights for the safety of their neighbours. If such be a slave country, the sooner it is depopulated the better. But it is not true. A more innocent race than the African does not exist on the earth. They are less given to violence and murder, than we Anglo-Saxons. But when did wrong ever want excuse? When did oppression ever fail to make out a good cause in its own eyes?

The truth is, that Slavery is perpetuated at the South, not from the fear of massacre, but from a stronger principle. A respected slaveholder said to me not long ago, "The question of slavery is a question of property, and property is dearer to man than life." The master holds fast his slave, because he sees in him, not a wild beast, but a profitable chattel. Mr. Clay has told us, that the slaves are worth in the market, I think, twelve hundred millions of dollars, and smiles at the thought of calling men to surrender such a mass of property. It is not because they are so fierce, but so profitable that they are kept in chains. Were they meek angels from God's throne, imprisoned for a while in human frames, and were they at the same time worth twelve hundred millions of dollars in the market, comparatively few, I fear, would be suffered to return to their native skies, as long as the chain could fetter them to the plantation. I know that there are

generous exceptions to the spirit of slavery as now portrayed; but this spirit in the main is mercenary. I know that other considerations than this of property, that considerations of prudence and benevolence, help to confirm the slaveholder in his aversion to Emancipation. There are mixed motives for perpetuating slavery, as for almost all human actions. But the grand motive is Gain, the love of Money, the unwillingness to part with Property, and were this to yield to justice and humanity, the dread of massacre would not long retard emancipation.

My friends, your compassion is often called forth by predictions of massacre, of butchered children, of violated women, in case of emancipation. But do not waste your sympathies on possible evils, which wisdom and kindness may avert. Keep some of your tears and tenderness for what exists; for the poor girl whose innocence has no protection; for the wife and mother who may be widowed and made childless before night by a stroke of the auctioneer's hammer; for the man subjected to the whip of a brutal overseer, and hunted, if he flies, by blood-hounds, and shot down if he outstrips his pursuers. For the universe, I would not let loose massacre on the Southern States, or on any population. Sooner would I have all the slaves perish than achieve their freedom by promiscuous carnage. But I see no necessity of carnage. I am sure that to treat men with justice and humanity, is not the way to turn them into robbers or assassins. Undoubtedly wisdom is to be used in conferring this great good. We ask no precipitate action at the South; we dictate no mode of conferring freedom. We ask only a settled purpose to bring slavery to an end, and we are sure that this will

devise a safe and happy way of exercising justice and love.

Am I asked what is the duty of the North in regard to slavery? On this subject I have lately written; I will only say, I recommend no crusade against slavery, no use of physical or legislative power for its destruction, no irruption into the South to tamper with the slave, or to repeal or resist the laws. Our duties on this subject are plain. First, we must free ourselves, as I have said, from all constitutional or legal obligations to uphold slavery. In the next place, we must give free and strong expression to our reprobation of slavery. The North has but one weapon, moral force, the utterance of moral judgment, moral feeling, and religious conviction. I do not say that this alone is to subvert slavery. Providence never accomplishes its ends by a single instrument. All social changes come from mixed motives, from various impulses, and slavery is to fall through various causes. But among these, a high place will belong to the general conviction of its evils and wrongs. Opinion is stronger than kings, mobs, lynch laws, or any other laws for repressing thought and speech. Whoever spreads through his circle, be it wide or narrow, just opinions and feelings in regard to slavery, hastens its fall. There is one point on which your moral influence may be exerted with immediate effect. Should a slave-hunter ever profane these mountainous retreats by seeking here a flying bondman, regard him as a legalised robber. Oppose no force to him; you need not do it. Your contempt and indignation will be enough to disarm "the man-stealer" of the unholy power conferred on him by unrighteous laws.

I began this subject in hope, and in hope I end. I have turned aside to speak of the great stain on our country, which makes us the bye-word and scorn of the nations; but I do not despair. Mighty powers are at work in the world. Who can stay them? God's word has gone forth, and "it cannot return to him void." A new comprehension of the Christian spirit, a new reverence for humanity, a new feeling of brotherhood and of all men's relation to the common Father—this is among the signs of our times. We see it; do we not feel it? Before this, all oppressions are to fall. Society silently pervaded by this, is to change its aspect of universal warfare for peace. The power of selfishness, all-grasping and seemingly invincible, is to yield to this diviner energy. The song of angels, "On Earth Peace," will not always sound as fiction. Oh come, thou kingdom of Heaven, for which we daily pray! Come, Friend and Saviour of the race, who didst shed thy blood on the cross to reconcile man to man, and Earth to Heaven! Come, ye predicted ages of righteousness and love, for which the faithful have so long yearned. Come, Father Almighty, and crown with thine omnipotence the humble strivings of thy children to subvert oppression and wrong, to spread light and freedom, peace and joy, the truth and spirit of thy Son, through the whole earth.

THE CHURCH:

A DISCOURSE,

DELIVERED IN THE

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA,

SUNDAY, MAY 30, 1841.

THE CHURCH.

MATTHEW vii. 21–27.

Not every man that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Many will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.

Therefore, whosoever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, which built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: for it was founded upon a rock.

And every one that heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell; and great was the fall of it.

THESE words, which form the conclusion of Christ's Sermon on the Mount, teach a great truth, namely, that there is but one thing essential in religion; and this is, the doing of God's will, the doing of those sayings or precepts of Christ, which constitute the substance of that memorable discourse. We learn, that it will avail us nothing to call Christ Lord, Lord, to profess ourselves his disciples, to hear his words, to teach in his name, to take our place in his church, or

even to do wonderful works or miracles in attestation of his truth, if we neglect to cherish the spirit and virtues of his religion. God heeds not what we say, but what we are and what we do. The subjection of our wills to the divine; the mortification of sensual and selfish propensities; the cultivation of supreme love to God, and of universal justice and charity towards our neighbour; this, this is the very essence of religion; this, alone, places us on a rock; this is the end, the supreme and ultimate good, and is to be prized and sought above all other things.

This is a truth as simple as it is grand. The child can understand it; and yet men, in all ages, have contrived to overlook it; have contrived to find substitutes for purity of heart and life; have hoped by some other means to commend themselves to God, to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Forms, creeds, churches, the priesthood, the sacraments, these and other things have been exalted into supremacy. The grand and only qualification for heaven, that which in itself is heaven, the virtue and the spirit of Jesus Christ, has been obscured, depreciated; whilst assent to certain mysteries, or union with certain churches, has been thought the narrow way that leads to life. I have not time in a single discourse to expose all the delusions which have spread on this subject. I shall confine myself to one, which is not limited to the past, but too rife in our own times.

There has always existed, and still exists, a disposition to attach undue importance to "the church" which a man belongs to. To be a member of the "true church," has been insisted on as essential to human salvation. Multitudes have sought comfort, and not

seldom found their ruin, in the notion that they were embraced in the motherly arms of the "true church," for with this they have been satisfied. Professed Christians have fought about "the church," as if it were a matter of life and death. The Roman Catholic shuts the gate of Heaven on you, because you will not enter his "church." Among the Protestants are those who tell you, that the promises of Christianity do not belong to you, be your character what it may, unless you receive the Christian ordinances from the ministers of their church. Salvation is made to flow through a certain priesthood, through a hereditary order, through particular rites administered by consecrated functionaries. Even among denominations in which such exclusive claims are not set up, you will still meet the idea, that a man is safer in their particular church than elsewhere; so that something distinct from Christian purity of heart and life, is made the way of salvation.

This error I wish to expose. I wish to show, that Christ's spirit, Christ's virtue, or "the doing of the Sermon on the Mount," is the great end of our religion, the only essential thing, and that all other things are important only as ministering to this. I know, indeed, that very many acknowledge the doctrine now expressed. But too often their conviction is not deep and living, and it is impaired by superstitious notions of some mysterious saving influence in the church or in some other foreign agency. To meet these erroneous tendencies, I shall not undertake to prove in a formal way, by logical process, the supreme importance, blessedness, and glory of righteousness, of sanctity, of love towards God and man, or to prove that nothing else is indispensable. This truth shines by its own light. It runs

through the whole New Testament; and is a gospel written in the soul by a divine hand. To vindicate it against the claims set up for the church, nothing is needed but to offer a few plain remarks in the order in which they rise up of themselves to my mind.

I begin with the remark, that in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus said nothing about the Church; nor do we find him or his disciples laying down anywhere a definite plan for its organization or a ritual for its worship. Nor ought this to surprise us. It was the very thing to be expected in such a religion as Christianity. Judaism was intended to educate a particular nation, half-civilised and surrounded with the grossest idolatry, and accordingly it hedged them in by multiplied and rigid forms. But Christianity proposes as its grand aim, to spread the inward spiritual worship of God through all nations, in all stages of society, under all varieties of climate, government, and condition, and such a religion cannot be expected to confine itself to any particular outward shape. Especially when we consider, that it is destined to endure through all ages, to act on all, to blend itself with new forms of society and with the highest improvements of the race, it cannot be expected to ordain an immutable mode of administration, but must leave its modes of worship and communion to conform themselves silently and gradually to the wants and progress of humanity. The rights and arrangements which suit one period, lose their significance or efficiency in another. The forms which minister to the mind now, may fetter it hereafter, and must give place to its free unfolding. A system wanting this freedom and flexibleness would carry strong proof in itself of not having been intended for univer-

sality. It is one proof of Christ's having come to "inherit all nations," that he did not institute for all nations and all times a precise machinery of forms and outward rules, that he entered into no minute legislation as to the worship and government of his church, but left these outward concerns to be swayed by the spirit and progress of successive ages. Of consequence, no particular order of the church can be essential to salvation. No church can pretend, that its constitution is defined and ordained in the Scriptures so plainly and undeniably, that whoever forsakes it gives palpable proof of a spirit of disobedience to God. All churches are embraced by their members with equal religious reverence, and this assures us that in all God's favour may be equally obtained.

It is worthy of remark, that, from the necessity of the case, the church asssumed at first a form which it could not long retain. It was governed by the Apostles who had founded it, men who had known Christ personally, and received his truth from his lips, and witnessed his resurrection, and were enriched above all men by the miraculous illuminations and aids of his spirit. These presided over the church with an authority peculiar to themselves, and to which none after them could, with any reason, pretend. They understood "the mind of Christ," as none could do but those who had enjoyed so long and close an intimacy with him; and not only were they sent forth with miraculous powers, but by imposition of their hands similar gifts of the Spirit were conferred on others. This presence of inspired Apostles and supernatural powers gave to the primitive church obvious and important distinctions, separating it widely from the form

which it was afterwards to assume. Of this we have a remarkable proof in a passage of Paul, in which he sets before us the offices or functions exercised in the original church. "God hath set in the church apostles prophets, teachers, gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues."* Now, of all these endowments or offices, one only, that of teacher, remains in our day. The Apostles, the founders and heroes of the primitive church, with their peculiar powers, have vanished, leaving us their representatives their writings to be studied alike by all. Teachers remain, not because they existed in the first age, but because their office, from its nature, and from the condition of human nature, is needed still. The office, however, has undergone an important change. At first the Christian teacher enjoyed immediate communication with the Apostles, and received miraculous aids, and thus enjoyed means of knowledge possessed by none of his successors. The Christian minister now, can only approach the Apostles as other men do, that is, through the Gospels and Epistles which they have left us; and he has no other aid from above in interpreting them, than every true Christian enjoys. The promise of the Holy Spirit, that greatest of promises, is made without distinction, to every man of every office or rank, who perseveringly implores the Divine help; and this establishes an essential equality among all. Whether teachers are to continue in the brighter ages which prophecy announces, is rendered doubtful by a very striking prediction of the times of the Messiah; "In those days," saith the Lord, "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will

* 1 Cor. xii. 28.

be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbour, and every man his brother, saying, Know the LORD: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest."* Is it possible that any man, with a clear comprehension of the peculiarity of the primitive church, can look back to this as an immutable form and rule, can regard any church form as essential to salvation, can ascribe to outward ordinances, so necessarily fluctuating, an importance to be compared with that which belongs to the immutable everlasting distinctions of holiness and virtue?

The church, as at first constituted, presents interesting and beautiful aspects. It was not a forced and arbitrary, but free, spontaneous union. It grew out of the principles and feelings of human nature. Our nature is social. We cannot live alone. We cannot shut up any great feeling in our hearts. We seek for others to partake it with us. The full soul finds at once relief and strength in sympathy. This is especially true in religion, the most social of all our sentiments, the only universal bond on earth. In this law of our nature, the Christian church had its origin. Christ did not establish it in a formal way. If you consult the New Testament, you do not find Jesus or his Apostles setting about the task of forming an artificial organization of the first disciples. Read in the book of Acts, the simple touching narratives of the union of the first converts. They were of one heart and one soul. They could not be kept asunder. The new truth melted them into one mass, knit them into one body. In their mutual love, they could not withhold

* Jeremiah xxxi. 33, 34.

from one another their possessions, but had all things in common. Blessed unity! a type of that oneness and harmony, which a purer Christianity is to spread through all nations. Among those early converts, the most gifted and enlightened were chosen to be teachers in public assemblies. To these assemblies the brotherhood repaired with eagerness, to hear expositions of the new faith, to strengthen one another's loyalty to Christ, and to be open witnesses of him in the world. In their meetings they were left very much to follow the usages of the synagogue, in which they had been brought up; so little did Christianity trouble itself about forms. How simple, how natural this association! It is no mystery. It grew out of the plainest wants of the human heart. The religious sentiment, the spirit of love towards God and man, awakened afresh by Christ, craved for a new union through which to find utterance and strength. And shall this church union, the growth of the Christian spirit, and so plainly subordinate to it, usurp its place, or in any way detract from its sole sufficiency, from its supreme, unrivalled glory?

The church, according to its true idea and purpose, is an association of sincere, genuine followers of Christ; and at first this idea was, in a good degree, realised. The primitive disciples were drawn to Christ by conviction. They met together and confessed him, not from usage, fashion, or education, but in opposition to all these. In that age, profession and practice, the form and the spirit, the reality and the outward signs of religion went together. But with the growth of the church, its life declined; its great idea was obscured; the name remained, and sometimes little more than the

name. It is a remarkable fact, that the very spirit to which Christianity is most hostile, the passion for power, dominion, pomp, and pre-eminence, struck its deepest roots in the Church. The church became the very stronghold of the lusts and vices which Christianity most abhors. Accordingly, its history is one of the most melancholy records of past times. It is sad enough to read the blood-stained annals of worldly empires; but when we see the spiritual kingdom of Christ, a prey for ages to usurping popes, prelates, or sectarian chiefs, inflamed with bigotry and theological hate and the lust of rule, and driven by these fires of hell to grasp the temporal sword, to persecute, torture, imprison, butcher their brethren, to mix with and embitter national wars, and to convulse the whole Christian world, we experience a deeper gloom, and are more tempted to despair of our race. History has not a darker page than that which records the persecutions of the Albigenses, or the horrors of the Inquisition. And when we come to later times, the church wears anything rather than holiness inscribed on her front. How melancholy to a Christian, the history lately given us by Ranke, of the reaction of Catholicism against Protestanism! Throughout, we see the ecclesiastical powers resorting to force as the grand instrument of conversion; thus proving their alliance not with heaven, but with earth and hell. If we take broad views of the church, in any age or land, how seldom do we see the prevalence of true sanctity! How many of its ministers preach for lucre or display, preach what they do not believe, or deny their doctrines in their lives! How many congregations are there made up in a great degree, of worldly men and women, who repair to the

house of God from usage, or for propriety's sake, or from a vague notion of being saved!—not from thirst for the divine spirit, not from a fulness of heart, which longs to pour itself forth in prayer and praise. Such is the church. We are apt, indeed, to make it an abstraction, or to separate it in our thoughts from the individuals who compose it; and thus it becomes to us a holy thing, and we ascribe to it strange powers. Theologians speak of it as a unity, a mighty whole, one and the same in all ages; and in this way the imagination is cheated into the idea of its marvellous sanctity and grandeur. But we must separate between the theory or the purpose of the church, and its actual state. When we come down to facts, we see it to be not a mysterious, immutable unity, but a collection of fluctuating, divided, warring individuals, who bring into it, too often, hearts and hands anything but pure. Painful as it is, we must see things as they are; and so doing, we cannot but be struck with the infinite absurdity of ascribing to such a church mysterious powers, of supposing that it can confer holiness on its members, or that the circumstance of being joined to it is of the least moment in comparison with purity of heart and life.

Purity of heart and life, Christ's spirit of love towards God and man; this is all in all. This is the only essential thing. The church is important only as it ministers to this; and every church which so ministers, is a good one, no matter how, when, or where it grew up, no matter whether it worship on its knees or on its feet, or whether its ministers are ordained by pope, bishop, presbyter, or people; these are secondary things, and of no comparative moment. The church

which opens on heaven, is that and that only in which the spirit of heaven dwells. The church whose worship rises to God's ear, is that and that only where the soul ascends. No matter whether it be gathered in cathedral or barn; whether it sit in silence or send up a hymn; whether the minister speak from carefully prepared notes, or from immediate, fervent, irrepressible suggestion. If God be loved, and Jesus Christ be welcomed to the soul, and his instructions be meekly and wisely heard, and the solemn purpose grow up to do all duty amidst all conflict, sacrifice, and temptation, then the true end of the church is answered. "This is no other than the house of God, the gate of heaven."

In these remarks, I do not mean that all churches are of equal worth. Some, undoubtedly, correspond more than others to the spirit and purpose of Christianity, to the simple usages of the primitive disciples, and to the principles of human nature. All have their superstitions and corruptions, but some are more pure than the rest; and we are bound to seek that which is purest, which corresponds most to the Divine will. As far as we have power to select, we should go to the church where we shall be most helped to become devout, disinterested, and morally strong. Our salvation, however, does not depend on our finding the best church on earth; for this may be distant, or unknown. Amidst diversities of administrations, there is the same spirit. In all religious societies professing Christ as their Lord, the plainest, grandest truths of religion will almost certainly be taught, and some souls may be found touched and enlightened from above. This is a plain, undeniable fact. In all sects, various as they are, good and holy men may be found, nor can we tell

in which the holiest have grown up. The church, then, answers its end in all; for its only end is to minister to human virtue. It is delightful to read, in the records of all denominations, the lives of eminent Christians, who have given up everything for their religion, who have been faithful unto death, who have shed around them the sweet light and fragrance of Christian hope and love. We cannot, then, well choose amiss, if we choose the church, which, as it seems to us, best represents the grand ideas of Christ, and speaks most powerfully to our consciences and hearts. This church, however, we must not choose for our brother. He differs from us probably in temperament, in his range of intellect, or in the impressions which education and habit have given him. Perhaps the worship which most quickens you and me, may hardly keep our neighbour awake. *He* must be approached through the heart and imagination; *we* through the reason. What to him is fervour, passes with us for noise. What to him is an imposing form, is to us vain show. Condemn him not. If in his warmer atmosphere he builds up a stronger faith in God and a more steadfast choice of perfect goodness than ourselves, his church is better to him than ours to us.

One great error in regard to churches, contributes to the false estimate of them as essential to salvation. We imagine, that the church, the minister, the worship, can do something for us mechanically; that there are certain mysterious influences in what we call a holy place, which may act on us without our own agency. It is not so. The church and the minister can do little for us in comparison with what we must do for ourselves, and nothing for us without ourselves. They

become to us blessings through our own activity. Every man must be his own priest. It is his own action, not the minister's, it is the prayer issuing from his own heart, not from another's lips, which aids him in the church. The church does him good, only as by its rites, prayers, hymns, and sermons, it wakes up his spirit to think, feel, pray, praise, and resolve. The church is a help, not a force. It acts on us by rational and moral means, and not by mystical operations. Its influence resembles precisely that which is exerted out of church. Its efficiency depends chiefly on the clearness, simplicity, sincerity, love, and zeal, with which the minister speaks to our understandings, consciences, and hearts; just as in common life we are benefited by the clearness and energy with which our friends set before us what is good and pure. The church is adapted to our free moral nature. It acts on us as rational and responsible beings, and serves us through our own efficiency. From these views, we learn that the glory of the church does not lie in any particular government or form, but in the wisdom with which it combines such influences as are fitted to awaken and purify the soul.

Am I asked to state more particularly what these influences are, to which the church owes its efficacy? I reply, that they are such as may be found in all churches, in all denominations. The first is, the *character* of the minister. This has an obvious, immediate, and powerful bearing on the great spiritual purpose of the church. I say his character, not his ordination. Ordination has no end but to introduce into the sacred office men qualified for its duties, and to give an impression of its importance. It is by his personal en-

dowments, by his intellectual, moral, and religious worth, by his faithfulness and zeal, and not through any mysterious ceremony or power, that the minister enlightens and edifies the church. What matters it how he is ordained or set apart, if he give himself to his work in the fear of God? What matters it who has laid hands on him, or whether he stand up in surplice or drab coat? I go to church to be benefited not by hands or coats, but by the action of an enlightened and holy teacher on my mind and heart; not an overpowering, irresistible action, but such as becomes effectual through my own free thought and will. I go to be convinced of what is true, and to be warmed with love of what is good; and he who thus helps me is a true minister, no matter from what school, consistory, or ecclesiastical body he comes. He carries his commission in his soul. Do not say that his ministry has no "validity," because Rome, or Geneva, or Lambeth, or Andover, or Princeton, has not laid hands on him. What! Has he not opened my eyes to see, and roused my conscience to reprove? As I have heard him, has not my heart burned within me; and have I not, silently, given myself to God with new humility and love? Have I not been pierced by his warnings, and softened by his looks and tones of love? Has he not taught and helped me to deny myself, to conquer the world, to do good to a foe? Has he done this, and yet has his ministry no "validity?" What other validity can there be than this? If a generous friend gives me water to drink when I am parched with thirst, and I drink and am refreshed, will it do to tell me, that because he did not buy the cup at a certain licensed shop, or draw the water at a certain antiquated cistern, therefore his act

of kindness is "invalid," and I am as thirsty and weak as I was before? What more can a minister with mitre or tiara do, than help me, by wise and touching manifestations of God's truth, to become a holier, nobler man? If my soul be made alive, no matter who ministers to me; and if not, the ordinances of the church, whether high or low, orthodox or heretical, are of no validity, so far as I am concerned. The diseased man who is restored to health, cares little whether his physician wear wig or cowl, or receive his diploma from Paris or London; and so, to the regenerate man, it is of little moment where or by what processes he became a temple of the Holy Spirit.

According to these views, a minister deriving power from his intellectual, moral, and religious worth, is one of the chief elements of a true and quickening church. Such a man will gather a true church round him; and we here learn, that a Christian community is bound to do what may aid, and to abstain from what may impair, the virtue, nobleness, spiritual energy of its minister. It should especially leave him free, should wish him to wear no restraints but those of a sense of duty. His office is to utter God's truth according to his apprehension of it, and he should be encouraged to utter it honestly, simply. He must follow his own conscience and no other. How can he rebuke prevalent error without an unawed spirit? Better that he should hold his peace, than not speak from his own soul. Better that the pulpit be prostrated, than its freedom be taken away. The doctrine of "instructions" in politics, is of very doubtful expediency; but that instructions should issue from the congregation to the minister, we all, with one voice, pronounce wrong. The religious

teacher, compelled to stifle his convictions, grows useless to his people, is shorn of his strength, loses self-respect, shrinks before his own conscience, and owes it to himself to refrain from teaching. If he be honest, upright, and pure, worthy of trust, worthy of being a minister, he has a right to freedom; and when he uses it conscientiously, though he may err in judgment and may give pain to judicious hearers, he has still a right to respect. There are, indeed, few religious societies which would knowingly make the minister a slave. Many err on the side of submission, and receive his doctrines with blind, unquestioning faith. Still the members of a congregation, conscious of holding the support of their teacher in their hands, are apt to expect a cautious tenderness towards their known prejudices or judgments, which, though not regarded as servility, is very hostile to that firm, bold utterance of truth, on which the success of his ministry chiefly depends.

I have mentioned the first condition of the most useful church; it is the high character of its minister. The second is to be found in the spiritual character of its members. This, like the former, is, from the very principles of human nature, fitted to purify and save. It was the intention of Christ, that a quickening power should be exerted in a church, not by the minister alone, but also by the members on one another. Accordingly, we read of the "working of every part, every joint," in his spiritual body. We come together in our places of worship, that heart may act on heart; that, in the midst of the devout, a more fervent flame of piety may be kindled in our own breasts; that we may hear God's word more eagerly, by knowing that

it is drunk in by thirsty spirits around us; that our own purpose of obedience, may be confirmed by the consciousness that a holy energy of will is unfolding itself in our neighbours. To this sympathy the church is dedicated; and in this its highest influence is sometimes found. To myself, the most effectual church is that in which I see the signs of Christian affection in those around me, in which warm hearts are beating on every side, in which a deep stillness speaks of the absorbed soul, in which I recognise fellow-beings, who in common life have impressed me with their piety. One look from a beaming countenance, one tone in singing from a deeply moved heart, perhaps aids me more than the sermon. When nothing is said, I feel it good to be among the devout; and I wonder not that the Quakers, in some of their still meetings, profess to hold the most intimate union, not only with God, but with each other. It is not with the voice only that man communicates with man. Nothing is so eloquent as the deep silence of a crowd. A sigh, a low breathing, sometimes pours into us our neighbour's soul more than a volume of words. There is a communication more subtile than freemasonry, between those who feel alike. How contagious is holy feeling! On the other hand, how freezing, how palsying is the gathering of a multitude, who feel nothing, who come to God's house without reverence, without love, who gaze around on each other as if they were assembled at a show, whose restlessness keeps up a slightly disturbing sound, whose countenances reveal no collectedness, no earnestness, but a frivolous or absent mind! The very sanctity of the place makes this indifference more chilling. One of the coldest spots on earth is a church without devo-

tion. What is it to me, that a costly temple is set apart by ever so many rites for God's service, that priests who trace their lineage to Apostles, have consecrated it, if I find it thronged by the worldly and undevout. This is no church to me. I go to meet, not human bodies, but souls; and if I find them in an upper room, like that where the first disciples met, or in a shed, or in a street, there I find a church. There is the true altar, the sweet incense, the accepted priest. These all I find in sanctified souls.

True Christians give a sanctifying power, a glory, to the place of worship, where they come together. In them Christ is present and manifested in a far higher sense, than if he were revealed to the bodily eye. We are apt indeed to think differently. Were there a place of worship, in which a glory like that which clothed Jesus on the Mount of transfiguration, were to shine forth, how should we throng to it, as the chosen spot on earth! How should we honour this as eminently his church! But there is a more glorious presence of Christ than this. It is Christ formed in the souls of his disciples. Christ's bodily presence does not make a church. He was thus present in the thronged streets of Jerusalem, present in the synagogues and temples; but these were not churches. It is the presence of his spirit, truth, likeness, divine love, in the souls of men, which attracts and unites them into one living body. Suppose that we meet together in a place consecrated by all manner of forms, but that nothing of Christ's spirit dwells in us. With all its forms, it is a synagogue of Satan, not a church of Jesus. Christ in the hearts of men, I repeat it, is the only church bond. The Catholics, to give them a feeling of the present Saviour, adorn

their temples with paintings, representing him in the most affecting scenes of his life and death; and had worship never been directed to these, I should not object to them. But there is a far higher likeness to Christ than the artist ever drew or chiselled. It exists in the heart of his true disciple. The true disciple surpasses Raphael and Michael Angelo. The latter have given us Christ's countenance from fancy, and at best having little likeness to the mild beauty and majestic form which moved through Judea. But the disciple, who sincerely conforms himself to the disinterestedness, and purity, and filial worship, and all-sacrificing love of Christ, gives us no fancied representation, but the true divine lineaments of his soul, the very spirit which beamed in his face, which spoke in his voice, which attested his glory as the Son of God. The truest church is that which has, in the highest degree, this spiritual presence of our Lord, this revelation of Jesus in his followers. This is the church in which we shall find the greatest aid to our virtue, which outward institution can afford us.

I have thus spoken of the two chief elements of a living and effectual church; a pure, noble-minded minister, and faithful followers of Christ. In the preceding remarks, I have had chiefly in view particular churches, organised according to some particular forms; and I have maintained, that these are important only as ministering to Christian holiness or virtue. There is, however, a grander church, to which I now ask your attention; and the consideration of this will peculiarly confirm the lesson on which I am insisting, namely, that there is but one essential thing, true holiness, or disin-

terested love to God and man. There is a grander church than all particular ones, however extensive; the Church Catholic, or Universal, spread over all lands, and one with the church in heaven. That all Christ's followers form one body, one fold, is taught in various passages in the New Testament. You remember the earnestness of his last prayer, "that they might all be One, as he and his Father are one." Into this church all who partake the spirit of Christ are admitted. It asks not, Who has baptised us? Whose passport we carry? What badge we wear? If "baptised by the Holy Ghost," its wide gates are opened to us. Within this church are joined those whom different names have severed or still sever. We hear nothing of Greek, Roman, English churches, but of Christ's church only. My friends, this is not an imaginary union. The Scriptures, in speaking of it, do not talk rhetorically, but utter the soberest truth. All sincere partakers of Christian virtue are essentially one. In the spirit which pervades them dwells a uniting power found in no other tie. Though separated by oceans, they have sympathies strong and indissoluble. Accordingly, the clear, strong utterance of one gifted, inspired Christian flies through the earth. It touches kindred chords in another hemisphere. The word of such a man as Fenelon, for instance, finds its way into the souls of scattered millions. Are not he and they of one church? I thrill with joy at the name of holy men who lived ages ago. Ages do not divide us. I venerate them more for their antiquity. Are we not one body? Is not this union something real? It is not men's coming together into one building which makes a church. Suppose that, in a place of worship, I sit so near a fellow-creature as to

touch him; but that there is no common feeling between us; that the truth which moves me, he inwardly smiles at as a dream of fancy; that the disinterestedness which I honour, he calls weakness or wild enthusiasm. How far apart are we, though visibly so near? We belong to different worlds. How much nearer am I to some pure, generous spirit in another continent, whose word has penetrated my heart, whose virtues have kindled me to emulation, whose pure thoughts are passing through my mind whilst I sit in the house of prayer! With which of these two have I church union?

Do not tell me, that I surrender myself to a fiction of imagination, when I say that distant Christians, that all Christians and myself, form one body, one church, just as far as a common love and piety possess our hearts. Nothing is more real than this spiritual union. There *is* one grand all-comprehending church; and if I am a Christian I belong to it, and no man can shut me out of it. You may exclude me from your Roman church, your Episcopal church, and your Calvinistic church, on account of supposed defects in my creed or my sect, and I am content to be excluded. But I will not be severed from the great body of Christ. Who shall sunder me from such men as Fenelon, and Pascal, and Boromeo, from Archbishop Leighton, Jeremy Taylor, and John Howard? Who can rupture the spiritual bond between these men and myself? Do I not hold them dear? Does not their spirit, flowing out through their writings and lives, penetrate my soul? Are they not a portion of my being? Am I not a different man from what I should have been, had not these and other like spirits acted on mine? And is it in the power of synod or conclave, or of all the ecclesiastical combina-

tions on earth, to part me from them? I am bound to them by thought and affection; and can these be suppressed by the bull of a pope or the excommunication of a council? The soul breaks scornfully these barriers, these webs of spiders, and joins itself to the great and good; and if it possess their spirit, will the great and good, living or dead, cast it off, because it has not enrolled itself in this or another sect? A pure mind is free of the universe. It belongs to the church, the family of the pure in all worlds. Virtue is no local thing. It is not honourable, because born in this community or that, but for its own independent everlasting beauty. This is the bond of the universal church. No man can be excommunicated from it but by himself, by the death of goodness in his own breast. All sentences of exclusion are vain, if he do not dissolve the tie of purity which binds him to all holy souls.

I honour the Roman Catholic church on one account; it clings to the idea of a Universal Church, though it has mutilated and degraded it. The word Catholic means Universal. Would to God, that the church which has usurped the name had understood the reality! Still Romanism has done something to give to its members the idea of their connection with that vast spiritual community or church, which has existed in all times and spread over all lands. It guards the memory of great and holy men who in all ages have toiled and suffered for religion, asserts the honours of the heroes of the faith, enshrines them in heaven as beatified saints, converts their legends into popular literature, appoints days for the celebration of their virtues, and reveals them almost as living to the eye by the pictures in which genius has immortalised their deeds.

In doing this Rome has fallen indeed into error. She has fabricated exploits for these spiritual persons, and exalted them into objects of worship. But she has also done good. She has given to her members the feeling of intimate relation to the holiest and noblest men in all preceding ages. An interesting and often a sanctifying tie connects the Roman Catholic with martyrs, and confessors, and a host of men whose eminent piety and genius and learning have won for them an immortality of fame. It is no mean service thus to enlarge men's ideas and affections, to awaken their veneration for departed greatness, to teach them their connection with the grandest spirits of all times. It was this feature of Catholicism, which most interested me in visiting Catholic countries. The services at the altar did not move, but rather pained me. But when I cast my eyes on the pictures on the walls, which placed before me the holy men of departed ages, now absorbed in devotion and lost in rapture, now enduring with meek courage and celestial hope the agonies of a painful death in defence of the truth, I was touched, and I hope made better. The voice of the officiating priest I did not hear; but these sainted dead spoke to my heart, and I was sometimes tempted to feel, as if an hour on Sunday spent in this communion, were as useful to me as if it had been spent in a Protestant church. These saints never rose to my thoughts as Roman Catholics. I never connected them with any particular church. They were to me living, venerable witnesses to Christ, to the power of religion, to the grandeur of the human soul. I saw what men might suffer for the truth, how they could rise above themselves, how real might become the ideas of God and a

higher life. This inward reverence for the departed good, helped me to feel myself a member of the church universal. I wanted no pope or priest to establish my unity with them. My own heart was witness enough to a spiritual fellowship. Is it not to be desired, that all our churches should have services to teach us our union with Christ's whole body? Would not this break our sectarian chains, and awaken reverence for Christ's spirit, for true goodness under every name and form? It is not enough to feel that we are members of this or that narrow communion. Christianity is universal sympathy and love. I do not recommend that our churches should be lined with pictures of saints. This usage must come in, if it come at all, not by recommendation, but by gradual change of tastes and feelings. But why may not the pulpit be used occasionally to give us the lives and virtues of eminent disciples in former ages? It is customary to deliver sermons on the history of Peter, John, Paul, and of Abraham and Elijah and other worthies of the Old Testament; and this we do because their names are written in the Bible. But goodness owes nothing to the circumstance of its being recorded in a sacred book, nor loses its claim to grateful, reverent commemoration, because not blazoned there. Moral greatness did not die out with the Apostles. Their lives were reported for this among other ends, that their virtues might be propagated to future times, and that men might spring up as worthy a place among the canonised as themselves. What I wish is, that we should learn to regard ourselves as members of a vast spiritual community, as joint heirs and fellow-worshippers with the goodly company of Christian heroes who have gone before us, instead of immuring ourselves in

particular churches. Our nature delights in this consciousness of vast connexion. This tendency manifests itself in the patriotic sentiment, and in the passionate clinging of men to a great religious denomination. Its true and noblest gratification is found in the deep feeling of a vital, everlasting connection with the universal church, with the innumerable multitude of the holy on earth and in heaven. This church we shall never make a substitute for virtue.

I have spoken of the Roman Catholic Church. My great objection to this communion is, that it has fallen peculiarly into the error which I am labouring to expose in this discourse, that it has attached idolatrous importance to the institution of the Church, that it virtually exalts this above Christ's spirit, above inward sanctity. Its other errors are of inferior importance. It does not offend me, that the Romanist maintains that a piece of bread, a wafer, over which a priest has pronounced some magical words, is the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ. I learn, indeed, in this error an humbling lesson of human credulity, of the weakness of human reason; but I see nothing in it which strikes at the essential principles of religion. When, however, the Roman Catholic goes farther, and tells me that God looks with abhorrence on all who will not see in the consecrated wafer Christ's flesh and blood; and when he makes the reception of this from the hands of a consecrated priest, the door into Christ's fold, then I am shocked by the dishonour he casts on God and virtue, by his debasing conceptions of our moral nature and of the Divine, and by his cruel disruption of the ties of human and Christian brotherhood. How sad and strange, that a man educated under Christianity should

place religion in a church connection, in church rites, should shut from God's family the wisest and the best, because they conscientiously abstain from certain outward ordinances. Is not holiness of heart and life dear to God for its own sake, dear to him without the manipulations of a priest, without the agency of a consecrated wafer? The grand error of Roman Catholicism is its narrow church-spirit, its blind sectarianism, its exclusion of virtuous, pious men from God's favour, because they cannot eat, drink, or pray, according to certain prescribed rites. Romanism has to learn, that nothing but the inward life is great and good in the sight of the Omniscient, and that all who cherish this are members of Christ's body. Romanism is anything but what it boasts to be, the Universal Church. I am too much a Catholic to enlist under its banner.

I belong to the Universal Church; nothing shall separate me from it. In saying this, however, I am no enemy to particular churches. In the present age of the world, it is, perhaps, best that those who agree in theological opinions, should worship together; and I do not object to the union of several such churches in one denomination, provided that *all* sectarian and narrow feeling be conscientiously and scrupulously resisted. I look on the various churches of Christendom with no feelings of enmity. I have expressed my abhorrence of the sectarian spirit of Rome; but in that, as in all other churches, individuals are better than their creed; and amidst gross error and the inculcation of a narrow spirit, noble virtues spring up, and eminent Christians are formed. It is one sign of the tendency of human nature to goodness, that it grows good under a thousand bad influences. The Romish church is illustrated by

great names. Her gloomy convents have often been brightened by fervent love to God and man. Her St. Louis, and Fenelon, and Massillon, and Cheverus; her missionaries, who have carried Christianity to the ends of the earth; her sisters of charity, who have carried relief and solace to the most hopeless want and pain: do not these teach us that in the Romish church the Spirit of God has found a home? How much, too, have other churches to boast. In the English church, we meet the names of Latimer, Hooker, Barrow, Leighton, Berkely, and Heber; in the dissenting Calvinistic church, Baxter, Howe, Watts, Doddridge, and Robert Hall; among the Quakers, George Fox, William Penn, Robert Barclay, and our own Anthony Benezet and John Woolman; in the Anti-trinitarian church, John Milton, John Locke, Samuel Clarke, Price, and Priestley. To repeat these names does the heart good. They breathe a fragrance through the common air. They lift up the whole race to which they belonged. With the churches of which they were pillars or chief ornaments, I have many sympathies; nor do I condemn the union of ourselves to these or any other churches whose doctrines we approve, provided that we do it without severing ourselves in the least from the universal church. On this point we cannot be too earnest. We must shun the spirit of sectarianism as from hell. We must shudder at the thought of shutting up God in any denomination. We must think no man the better for belonging to our communion; no man the worse for belonging to another. We must look with undiminished joy on goodness, though it shine forth from the most adverse sect. Christ's spirit must be equally dear and honoured, no matter where manifested.

To confine God's love or his good spirit to any party, sect, or name, is to sin against the fundamental law of the kingdom of God; to break that living bond with Christ's universal church, which is one of our chief helps to perfection.

I have now given what seem to me the most important views in relation to the church; and in doing this, I have not quoted much from Scripture, because quotations cannot be given fully on this or any other controverted point in the compass of a discourse. I have relied on what is vastly more important, on the general strain and tone of Scripture, on the spirit of the Christian religion, on the sum and substance of Christ's teachings, which is plainly this, that inward holiness, or goodness, or disinterested love, is all in all. I also want time to consider at large the arguments or modes of reasoning by which this or that church sets itself forth as the only true church, and by which the necessity of entering it is thought to be proved. I cannot, however, abstain from offering a few remarks on these.

The principal arguments on which exclusive churches rest their claims, are drawn from Christian history and literature; in other words, from the records of the primitive ages of our faith, and from the writings of the early fathers. These arguments, I think, may be disposed of by a single remark, that they cannot be comprehended or weighed by the mass of Christians. How very, very few in our congregations can enter into the critical study of ecclesiastical history, or wade through the folios of the Greek and Latin fathers! Now, if it were necessary to join a particular church, in order to receive the blessings of Christianity, is it to be con-

ceived that the discovery of this church should require a learning plainly denied to the mass of human beings? Would not this church shine out with the brightness of the sun? Would it be hidden in the imperfect records of distant ages, or in the voluminous writings of a body of ancient authors, more remarkable for rhetoric than for soundness of judgment? The learned cannot agree about these authorities. How can the great multitudes of believers interpret them? Would not the Scriptures guide us by simple, sure rules, to the only true church, if to miss it were death? To my own mind this argument has a force akin to demonstration.

I pass to another method of defending the claims which one or another church sets up to exclusive acceptance with God. It is an unwarrantable straining of the figurative language of Scripture. Because the church is spoken of as one body, vine, or temple, theologians have argued that it is one outward organization, to which all men must be joined. But a doctrine built on metaphor is worth little. Every kind of absurdity may find a sanction in figures of speech, explained by tame, prosaic, cold-hearted commentators. The beautiful forms of speech to which I have referred, were intended to express the peculiarly close and tender union which necessarily subsists among all the enlightened and sincere disciples of such a religion as Christ's, a religion whose soul, essence, and breath of life is Love, which reveals to us in Jesus the perfection of philanthropy, and which calls to us to drink spiritually of that blood of self-sacrifice, which was shed for the whole human race. How infinitely exalted is the union of minds and hearts, formed by such a religion, above any outward connexion established by rites and forms!

Yet the latter has been seized on by the earthly understanding, as the chief meaning of Scripture, and magnified into supreme importance. Has not Paul taught us that there is but one perfect bond, Love?* Has not Christ taught us that the seal set on his disciples, by which all men are to know them, is Love? Is not this the badge of the true church, the life of the true body of Christ? And is not every disciple, of every name and form, who is inspired with this, embraced indissolubly in the Christian union?

It is sometimes urged by those who maintain the necessity of connection with what they call "the true church," that God has a right to dispense his blessings through what channels or on what terms he pleases; that if he sees fit to communicate his Holy Spirit through a certain priesthood or certain ordinances, we are bound to seek the gift in his appointed way; and that, having actually chosen this method of imparting it, he may justly withhold it from those who refuse to comply with his appointment. I reply, that the right of the Infinite Father to bestow his blessings in such ways as to his infinite wisdom and love may seem best, no man can be so irreverent as to deny. But is it not reasonable to expect, that he will adopt such methods or conditions as will seem to accord with his perfection? And ought we not to distrust such as seem to dishonour him? Suppose, for example, that I were told that the Infinite Father had decreed to give his Holy Spirit to such as should bathe freely in the sea. Ought I not to require the most plain, undeniable proofs of a purpose apparently so unworthy of his majesty and goodness, before yielding obedience to it? The presumption

* Colossians iii. 14.

against it is exceedingly strong. That the Infinite Father, who is ever present to the human soul, to whom it is unspeakably dear, who has created it for communion with himself, who desires and delights to impart to it his grace, that He should ordain sea-bathing as a condition or means of spiritual communication, is so improbable, that I must insist on the strongest testimony to its truth. Now, I meet precisely this difficulty in the doctrine that God bestows his Holy Spirit on those who receive bread and wine, or flesh and blood, or a form of benediction or baptism, or any other outward ministration, from the hands or lips of certain privileged ministers or priests. It is the most glorious act and manifestation of God's power and love, to impart enlightening, quickening, purifying influences to the immortal soul. To imagine that these descend in connection with certain words, signs, or outward rites, administered by a frail fellow-creature, and are withheld or abridged in the absence of such rites, seems, at first, an insult to his wisdom and goodness; seems to bring down his pure, infinite throne, to set arbitrary limits to his highest agency, and to assimilate his worship to that of false gods. The Scriptures teach us, "that God giveth grace to the humble;" that "he giveth his Holy Spirit to them that ask him." This is the great law of divine communications; and we can see its wisdom, because the mind, which hungers for Divine assistances, is most prepared to use them aright. And can we really believe that the prayers and aspirations of a penitent, thirsting soul, need to be seconded by the outward offices of a minister or priest? Or that, for want of these, they find less easy entrance into the ear of the ever-present, all-loving Father? My mind re-

coils from this doctrine as dishonourable to God, and I ought not to receive it without clear proofs. I want something more than metaphors, or analogies, or logical inferences. I want some express Divine testimony. And where is it given? Do we not know, that thousands and millions of Christians, whose lives and death have borne witness to their faith, have been unable to find it in the Scriptures, or anywhere else? And can we believe that the spiritual communication of such men with the Divinity has been forfeited or impaired, because they have abstained from rites which, in their consciences, they could not recognise as of Divine appointment? That so irrational and extravagant a doctrine should enter the mind of a man who has the capacity of reading the New Testament, would seem an impossibility, did not history show us that it has been not only believed, but made the foundation of the bitterest intolerance and the bloodiest persecutions.

The notion that by a decree of God's sovereign will his grace or spirit flows, through certain rites, to those who are in union with a certain church, and that it is promised to none besides, has no foundation in Scripture or reason. The church, as I have previously suggested, is not an arbitrary appointment; it does not rest on Will, but is ordained on account of its obvious fitness to accomplish the spiritual improvement, which is the end of Christianity. It corresponds to our nature. It is a union of means, and influences, and offices which rational and moral creatures need. It has no affinity with the magical operations so common in false religions; its agency is intelligible and level to the common mind. Its two great rites, baptism and the Lord's supper, are not meant to act as charms.

When freed from the errors and superstitions which have clung to them for ages, and when administered, as they should be, with tenderness and solemnity, they are powerful means of bringing great truths to the mind, and of touching the heart, and for these ends they are ordained. The adaptation of the church to the promotion of holiness among men, is its grand excellence; and where it accomplishes this end, its work is done, and no greater can be conceived on earth or in heaven. The moment we shut our eyes on this truth, and conceive of the church as serving us by forms and ordinances, which are effectual only in the hands of privileged officials or priests, we plunge into the region of shadows and superstitions. We have no ground to tread on, no light to guide us. This mysterious power, lodged in the hands of a few fellow-creatures, tends to give a servile spirit to the mass of Christians, to impair manliness and self-respect, to subdue the intellect to the reception of the absurdest dogmas. Religion loses its simple grandeur, and degenerates into mechanism and form. The conscience is quieted by something short of true repentance; something besides purity of heart and life is made the qualification for heaven. The surest device for making the mind a coward and a slave, is a wide-spread and closely-cemented church, the powers of which are concentrated in the hands of a "sacred order," and which has succeeded in arrogating to its rites or ministers a sway over the future world, over the soul's everlasting weal or woe. The inevitable, degrading influence of such a church, is demonstrative proof against its divine original.

There is no end to the volumes written in defence of

this or that church, which sets itself forth as the only true church, and claims exclusive acceptance with God. But the unlettered Christian has an answer to them all. He cannot, and need not seek it in libraries. He finds it, almost without seeking, in plain passages of the New Testament, and in his own heart. He reads, and he feels that religion is an Inward Life. This he knows, not by report, but by consciousness, by the prostration of his soul in penitence, by the surrender of his will to the Divine, by overflowing gratitude, by calm trust, and by a new love to his fellow-creatures. Will it do to tell such a man that the promises of Christianity do not belong to him, that access to God is denied him, because he is not joined with this or that exclusive church? Has not this access been granted to him already? Has he not prayed in his griefs, and been consoled? in his temptations, and been strengthened? Has he not found God near in his solitudes, and in the great congregation? Does he thirst for anything so fervently as for perfect assimilation to the Divine purity? And can he question God's readiness to help him, because he is unable to find in Scripture a command to bind himself to this or another self-magnifying church? How easily does the experience of the true Christian brush away the cobwebs of theologians! He loves and reveres God, and in this spirit has a foretaste of heaven; and can heaven be barred against him by ecclesiastical censures? He has felt the power of the cross and resurrection and promises of Jesus Christ; and is there any "height or depth" of human exclusiveness and bigotry which can separate him from his Lord? He can die for truth and humanity; and is there any man so swelled by the conceit

of his union with the true church, as to stand apart and say, "I am holier than thou?" When, by means of the writings or conversation of Christians of various denominations, you look into their hearts, and discern the deep workings, and conflicts, and aspirations of piety, can you help seeing in them tokens of the presence and operations of God's Spirit, more authentic and touching than in all the harmonies and beneficent influences of the outward universe? Who can shut up this Spirit in any place or any sect? Who will not rejoice to witness it in its fruits of justice, goodness, purity, and piety, wherever they meet the eye? Who will not hail it as the infallible sign of the accepted worshipper of God?

One word more respecting the arguments adduced in support of one or another exclusive church. They are continually and of necessity losing their force. Arguments owe their influence very much to the mental condition of those to whom they are addressed. What is proof to one man is no proof to another. The evidence which is triumphant in one age is sometimes thought below notice in the next. Men's reasonings on practical subjects are not cold, logical processes, standing separate in the mind, but are carried on in intimate connection with their prevalent feelings and modes of thought. Generally speaking, that and that only is truth to a man which accords with the common tone of his mind, with the mass of his impressions, with the results of his experience, with his measure of intellectual development, and especially with those deep convictions and biases which constitute what we call character. Now it is the tendency of increasing civilization, refinement, and expansion of mind, to produce a tone of

thought and feeling unfriendly to the church spirit, to reliance on church forms as essential to salvation. As the world advances, it leaves matters of form behind. In proportion as men get into the heart of things, they are less anxious about exteriors. In proportion as religion becomes a clear reality, we grow tired of shows. In the progress of ages, there spring up in greater numbers men of mature thought and spiritual freedom, who unite self-reverence with reverence of God, and who cannot, without a feeling approaching shame and conscious degradation, submit to a church which accumulates outward, rigid, mechanical observances towards the Infinite Father. A voice within them, which they cannot silence, protests against the perpetual repetition of the same signs, motions, words, as unworthy of their own spiritual powers, and of Him who deserves the highest homage of the reason and the heart. Their filial spirit protests against it. In common life, a refined, lofty mind expresses itself in simple, natural, unconstrained manners; and the same tendency, though often obstructed, is manifested in religion. The progress of Christianity, which must go on, is but another name for the growing knowledge and experience of that "spiritual worship of the Father" which Christ proclaimed as the end of his mission; and before this, the old, idolatrous reliance on ecclesiastical forms and organizations cannot stand. There is thus a perpetually swelling current which exclusive churches have to stem, and which must sooner or later sweep away their proud pretensions. What avails it that this or another church summons to its aid fathers, traditions, venerated usages? The Spirit, the Genius of Christianity, is stronger than all these. The great ideas of the religion must prevail

over narrow, perverse interpretations of it. On this ground, I have no alarm at reports of the triumphs of the Catholic church. The Spirit of Christianity is stronger than popes and councils. Its venerableness and divine beauty put to shame the dignities and pomps of a hierarchy; and men must more and more recognise it as alone essential to salvation.

From the whole discussion, through which I have now led you, you will easily gather how I regard the Church, and what importance I attach to it. In its true idea, or regarded as the union of those who partake in the spirit of Jesus Christ, I revere it as the noblest of all associations. Our common social unions are poor by its side. In the world we form ties of interest, pleasure, ambition. We come together as creatures of time and sense, for transient amusement or display. In the church, we meet as God's children; we recognise in ourselves something higher than this animal and worldly life. We come, that holy feeling may spread from heart to heart. The church, in its true idea, is a retreat from the world. We meet in it, that by union with the holy, we may get strength to withstand our common intercourse with the impure. We meet to adore God, to open our souls to his Spirit, and, by recognition of the Common Father, to forget all distinction among ourselves, to embrace all men as brothers. This spiritual union with the holy who are departed and who yet live, is the beginning of that perfect fellowship which constitutes Heaven. It is to survive all ties. The bonds of husband and wife, parent and child, are severed at death; the union of the virtuous friends of God and man is as eternal as virtue, and this union is the essence of the true church.

To the church relation, in this broad, spiritual view of it, I ascribe the highest dignity and importance. But as to union with a particular denomination, or with a society of Christians for public worship and instruction, this, however important, is not to be regarded as the highest means of grace. We ought, indeed, to seek help for ourselves, and to give help to others, by upholding religious institutions, by "meeting together in the name of Christ." The influence of Christianity is perpetuated and extended, in no small degree, by the public offices of piety, by the visible "communion of saints." But it is still true that the public means of religion are not its chief means. Private helps to piety are the most efficacious. The great work of religion is to be done, not in society, but in secret, in the retired soul, in the silent closet. Communion with God is eminently the means of religion, the nutriment and life of the soul, and we can commune with God in solitude as nowhere else. Here his presence may be most felt. It is by the breathing of the unrestrained soul, by the opening of the whole heart to "Him who seeth in secret;" it is by reviewing our own spiritual history, by searching deeply into ourselves, by solitary thought, and solitary, solemn consecration of ourselves to a new virtue; it is by these acts, and not by public gatherings, that we chiefly make progress in the religious life. It is common to speak of the house of public worship as a holy place; but it has no exclusive sanctity. The holiest spot on earth is that where the soul breathes its purest vows, and forms or executes its noblest purposes; and on this ground were I to seek the holiest spot in your city, I should not go to your splendid sanctuaries, but to closets of private prayer. Perhaps the "Holy of Holies" among you is

some dark narrow room, from which most of us would shrink as unfit for human habitation; but God dwells there. He hears there music more grateful than the swell of all your organs; sees there a beauty such as nature, in these her robes of spring, does not unfold; for there he meets, and sees, and hears the humblest, most thankful, most trustful worshipper; sees the sorest trials serenely borne, the deepest injuries forgiven; sees toils and sacrifices cheerfully sustained, and death approached through poverty and lonely illness, with a triumphant faith. The consecration which such virtues shed over the obscurest spot, is not and cannot be communicated by any of those outward rites, by which our splendid structures are dedicated to God.

You see the rank which belongs to the church, whether gathered in one place or spread over the whole earth. It is a sacred and blessed union; but must not be magnified above other means and helps of religion. The great aids of piety are secret, not public. The Christian cannot live without private prayer; he may live and make progress without a particular church. Providence may place us far from the resorts of our fellow-disciples, beyond the sound of the Sabbath-bell, beyond all ordinances; and we may find Sabbaths and ordinances in our own spirits. Illness may separate us from the outward church as well as from the living world, and the soul may yet be in health and prosper. There have been men of eminent piety, who, from conscience, have separated themselves from all denominations of Christians and all outward worship. Milton, that great soul, in the latter years of his life, forsook all temples made with hands, and worshipped wholly in the inward sanctuary. So did William Law, the au-

thor of that remarkable book, "The Serious Call to a holy life." His excess of devotion (for in him devotion ran into excess) led him to disparage all occasional acts of piety. He lived in solitude, that he might make life a perpetual prayer. These men are not named as models in this particular. They mistook the wants of the soul, and misinterpreted the Scriptures. Even they, with all their spirituality, would have found moral strength and holy impulse in religious association. But with such examples before us, we learn not to exclude men from God's favour, because severed from the outward church.

The doctrine of this discourse is plain. Inward sanctity, pure love, disinterested attachment to God and man, obedience of heart and life, sincere excellence of character, this is the one thing needful, this the essential thing in religion; and all things else, ministers, churches, ordinances, places of worship, all are but means, helps, secondary influences, and utterly worthless when separated from this. To imagine that God regards anything but this, that he looks at anything but the heart, is to dishonour him, to express a mournful insensibility to his pure character. Goodness, purity, virtue, this is the only distinction in God's sight. This is intrinsically, essentially, everlastingly, and by its own nature, lovely, beautiful, glorious, divine. It owes nothing to time, to circumstance, to outward connections. It shines by its own light. It is the sun of the spiritual universe. It is God himself dwelling in the human soul. Can any man think lightly of it, because it has not grown up in a certain church, or exalt any church above it? My friends, one of the grandest

truths of religion, is the supreme importance of character, of virtue, of that divine spirit which shone out in Christ. The grand heresy is, to substitute anything for this, whether creed, or form, or church. One of the greatest wrongs to Christ, is to despise his character, his virtue in a disciple who happens to wear a different name from our own.

When I represent to myself true virtue or goodness; not that which is made up of outward proprieties and prudent calculations, but that which chooses duty for its own sake, and as the first concern; which respects impartially the rights of every human being; which labours and suffers with patient resolution for truth and others' welfare; which blends energy and sweetness, deep humility and self-reverence; which places joyful faith in the perfection of God, communes with him intimately, and strives to subject to his pure will all thought, imagination, and desire; which lays hold on the promise of everlasting life, and in the strength of this hope endures calmly and firmly the sorest evils of the present state; when I set before me this virtue, all the distinctions on which men value themselves fade away. Wealth is poor; worldly honour is mean; outward forms are beggarly elements. Condition, country, church, all sink into unimportance. Before this simple greatness I bow, I revere. The robed priest, the gorgeous altar, the great assembly, the pealing organ, all the exteriors of religion, vanish from my sight, as I look at the good and great man, the holy, disinterested soul. Even I, with vision so dim, with heart so cold, can see and feel the divinity, the grandeur of true goodness. How, then, must God regard it! To his pure eye, how lovely must it be! And can

any of us turn from it, because some water has not been dropped on its forehead, or some bread put into its lips by a minister or priest; or because it has not learned to repeat some mysterious creed, which a church or human council has ordained?

My friends, reverence virtue, holiness, the upright will which inflexibly cleaves to duty and the pure law of God. Reverence nothing in comparison with it. Regard this as the end, and all outward services as the means. Judge of men by this. Think no man the better, no man the worse, for the church he belongs to. Try him by his fruits. Expel from your breasts the demon of sectarianism, narrowness, bigotry, intolerance. This is not, as we are apt to think, a slight sin. It is a denial of the supremacy of goodness. It sets up something, whether a form or dogma, above the virtue of the heart and the life. Sectarianism immures itself in its particular church as in a dungeon, and is there cut off from the free air, the cheerful light, the goodly prospects, the celestial beauty of the church universal.

My friends, I know that I am addressing those who hold various opinions as to the controverted points of theology. We have grown up under different influences. We bear different names. But if we purpose solemnly to do God's will, and are following the precepts and example of Christ, we are one church, and let nothing divide us. Diversities of opinion may incline us to worship under different roofs, or diversities of taste or habit, to worship with different forms. But these varieties are not schisms; they do not break the unity of Christ's Church. We may still honour, and love, and rejoice in one another's spiritual life and pro-

453

gress, as truly as if we were cast into one and the same unyielding form. God loves variety in nature and in the human soul, nor does he reject it in Christian worship. In many great truths, in those which are most quickening, purifying, and consoling, we all, I hope, agree. There is, too, a common ground of practice, aloof from all controversy, on which we may all meet. We may all unite hearts and hands in doing good, in fulfilling God's purposes of love towards our race, in toiling and suffering for the cause of humanity, in spreading intelligence, freedom, and virtue, in making God known for the reverence, love, and imitation of his creatures, in resisting the abuses and corruptions of past ages, in exploring and drying up the sources of poverty, in rescuing the fallen from intemperance, in succouring the orphan and the widow, in enlightening and elevating the depressed portions of the community, in breaking the yoke of the oppressed and enslaved, in exposing and withstanding the spirit and horrors of war, in sending God's Word to the ends of the earth, in redeeming the world from sin and woe. The angels and pure spirits who visit our earth, come not to join a sect, but to do good to all. May this universal charity descend on us, and possess our hearts; may our narrowness, exclusiveness, and bigotry, melt away under this mild celestial fire. Thus we shall not only join ourselves to Christ's Universal Church on earth, but to the invisible Church, to the innumerable company of the just made perfect, in the mansions of everlasting purity and peace.

GLASGOW:
JAMES HEDDERWICK AND SON, PRINTERS.


00070579

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 06 February, 2016